Sran

A GREEK IN THE TEMPLE;

Some Common-places delivered in *Trinity Colledge* Chapell in *Cambridge*, upon ACTS xvii, part of the 28. verse.

By JOHN SHERMAN Bachelour in Divinity, and Fellow of the same Colledge.

Ἐι μὲν οὖν ἔστι τις οἰκειότης πρὸς ἀλλήλους τοῖς λόγοις, πρ᾽ οὖργον ἂν ἡμῖν αὐτῶν ἡ γνῶσις· Ἐι δὲ μὴ, ἀλλὰ τό γε παράλληλα θέντας καταμαθεῖν τὸ διάφορον, οὐ μικρὸν εἰς βεβαίωσιν τοῦ βελτίονος. BASIL. *in Homilia, Ad Juvenes quomodo è Græcis utilitatem caperent.*

Printed by *Roger Daniel* Printer to the Universitie of *Cambridge*. 1641.

1641
S553
189284

To the Right Honourable,

Right Reverend, Right Worſhipfull, the Governours of the *Free-School* in the

CHARTERHOUSE.

MUch is ſpoken which ſhould not be thought, and written which ſhould not be ſpoken, and printed which ſhould not be written. Such may this diſcourſe be, or ſuch accounted: I am contented. Yet I go on with an ingenuous boldneſſe, in this ſmall bundle of Common-places, (as we call our morning Exerciſes) to re-

 preſent,

preſent, next unto God, unto you my thankfulneſſe, for my education in that Houſe, whereof you are the Worthy Governours. If I thus diſcharge this debt, the adventure of my credit will be leſſe dangerous, the loſſe more eaſie; ſince we are not bound ſo to a perfection of learning as we are bound to a perfection of Duty. The Stork is ſaid to leave one of her young ones where ſhe hatcheth, as it were out of ſome inſtinct of gratitude: and I, to return an acknowledgement of my breeding, preſent you with this little offspring of my mind, penned indeed rather then plumed.

They are next unto the firſt Common-places which I ever made. Since, much time, and years have run, wherein I might have added much, varied ſomewhat, poliſhed all: but I deſire to ſerve them up in their firſt and naturall dreſſe, and

and not to deceive you with my firſt Common-places laſt made.

The Poet calleth his books his *children*. This of mine is but a daughter; ſlight, ſlender, impertinent, unprofitable. Yet the raritie of the ſubject comforteth the Authour, that what cannot ſatisfie, becauſe not ſo uſefull, may pleaſe becauſe ſo unuſuall. Few ſuch texts there are; this, to my knowledge, not touched before.

In the way of the diſcourſe Hagar waiteth diligently upon Sarah, Humane learning carrieth the candle to Divinity: now the candle may be ſet down, and the ſervant may go out.

Be pleaſed to ſignifie the height of your Greatneſſe in a condeſcent of acceptance. The Preſſe hath delivered it into this legible faſhion in reſpect to your Qualitie: But I mean not that the world ſhall ſee it, either becauſe I would ſave

my modesty, or serve you more peculiarly. Do it the justice of favour, to think of it better then it deserveth; and me the honour, to vouchsafe me to be

Your most obliged

and humble servant,

JOHN SHERMAN.

Ad virum optimum & integerrimum,

Mr Johannem Shermannum,
de eruditiſſimo hoc ſuo pientiſſimóque
tractatu, προφητικόν.

*IN cœlo teſtes ſunt *Sol & Luna* fideles, *Pſal. 89. 35, 36.
Major émque probant lumina magna Deum.
Quando igitur verus fuerit de numine Teſtis,
* Cum Sole & Luna ſemper Aratus erit. * Ovid.
Tu quoque, qui Cilicis narraſti verba poetæ,
Et tua cum cœlo fama perennis erit.
Nè temne augurium; nam nos quoque numen habemus;
Crede mihi, vates enthea turba ſumus.

Τὸ γὰρ καὶ γένος ἐσμέν.——

Ad Lectorem in laudem Operis & Autoris.

LEctor, in hoc certant Pietas, Doctrina libello:
Neſcio num primas illa vel illa ferat.
Hoc ſcio, quod punctum, qui tam bene ſacra profanis,
Ethnica divinis miſcuit, omne tulit.
Scintillam veri dum Sanctus Apoſtolus iſto
*Ex *1 Cilice excudit, porrigit ille facem.*
Sacrum Gentili de ſtercore colligit aurum,
*Dum vertit Græci jugera multa * Soli;*
Eruit & gemmas, veterum dum ruſpat in agris
*Paucis ingenii tam bene * Aratus ager.*

* Alluſio ad patriam & urbem & nomen poetæ cujus hemiſtichium enarrat autor.

In

In Poetam à S. Paulo citatum.

CRetes & Cilices inter τρία κάππα κάκιστα
Sunt duo; quos teſtes pagina ſacra vocat:
Nec puduit Paulum Græcos * laudare poetas,
Hic vel Cretenſis ſit licèt, ille Cilix.
Sic Deus è tenebris educit lumen, amaris
Sic vos ex herbis mellificatis, apes.
In ſcriptis hominum ſit quodvis κάππα κάκιστον,
Aſt in divinis ἓν ἰῶτα μόνον.
Scilicet hîc nulli narrant mendacia Cretes,
Neve Solœciſmos ipſe Solenſis habet.

* citare.

JACO. DUPORT, S.T.B.

Coll. Trin. Cantab. Socius,

Græca Linguæ Profeſſor.

Acts xvii. 28.

As certain alſo of your own Poets have ſaid, For we are alſo his offspring.

IT is a principle, *Contra negantem principia non eſt diſputandum*, Againſt him that denieth principles we muſt not diſpute: But the ſenſe and importment of it is not to be taken otherwiſe then by way of ſpecification, That upon thoſe principles which are denied we cannot make a convenient diſcourſe. Argue with the Jews, who believe not in Chriſt, out of the Old Teſtament, as our Saviour did, and S. Paul in the ſecond verſe of this chapter. The Cerdonians denie the Old Teſtament; diſpute with them out of the New: with orthodox Chriſtians out of both: with Heathens out of neither. Reaſon is the naturall and common ground of argumentation: And thoſe that either never read a verſe in ſacred page, or deride what they have read, unleſſe they will in a peeviſh humour do that which for religion they will not do, namely denie themſelves, muſt be ruled by reaſon. Natures light is a ſubceleſtiall ſtarre in the orb of the microcoſme, Gods voice, mans uſher in the ſchool of the world. As truths ſupernaturall are not contradicted by reaſon; ſo neither ſurely is that contradicted by Scripture what is dictated by right reaſon. The Doctour of the Gentiles therefore in his encounter

with the Epicureans and Stoicks, as in the eighteenth verſe of this chapter, leaving thoſe principles of Scripture, the object whereof, Chriſt, was ſo ſtrange unto them, yea and the point of Reſurrection alſo, which naturall knowledge hath ſome glimpſe of, diſputeth with them out of their own principles of rationall light: which being the fountain of naturall Divinitie, and this naturall Divinitie conſiſting partly in artificiall diſcourſe, partly in inartificiall authority, the Apoſtle uſeth both; the firſt in the next verſe, the ſecond in this. Here he produceth a teſtimonie; in the next verſe he maketh an inference out of it. Thus he confuteth the Heathens with an Heathen, the Philoſophers with the Poet Aratus:

Ὡς καὶ τὸν ὅμοιον ἄγει Θεὸς ὡς τὸν ὅμοιον.

The words are little elſe then an indefinite Quotation and a rationall Aphoriſme. An indefinite Quotation; *As certain alſo of your own Poets have ſaid.* A rationall Aphoriſme; *We are alſo his offspring.* In the quotation we may obſerve, 1. the Quoter, S. Paul; 2. the Quoted, *certain of your own Poets*; 3. the Form of quotation, *as they have ſaid.* In the Quoted we have again, 1. the Manner of ſpeech touching them, *certain*; 2. the Profeſſion of them, *Poets*; 3. the Appropriation of them, *your own Poets: As certain alſo of your own Poets. Certain*; there is the manner of ſpeech concerning the quoted: And in this we have ſubincluded three conſiderations. Firſt it ſoundeth plurality: *certain*; not one onely. Secondly, it importeth reſtriction: *certain*; not all: *certain*, not many. Thirdly, it repreſenteth a kind of diſreſpectiveneſſe, an overly ſpeaking, not ſo much as honouring them with their naming: *certain of your own Poets.* This is the diviſion of the firſt part of the text, the indefinite Quotation.

Con-

Concerning the ſecond part, the rationall Aphoriſme, we ſhall firſt propound an Expoſition, and then raiſe three Propoſitions. An expoſition firſt, of the HIS in the text, who this HIS is whoſe offspring we are: ſecondly, of the particles FOR and ALSO, which ſeem to be of no uſe, ſince the ſenſe of the Aphoriſme is entire without them. The propoſitions do iſſue out of the ſeverall reſpects, wherein we may be ſaid to be his offſpring; *his*, that is Gods, as we ſhall hereafter declare. The three reſpects make the three propoſitions: We are Gods *offspring* in reſpect of our bodies; We are Gods *offspring* in reſpect of our ſouls; We are Gods *offspring* in reſpect of both together.

Firſt now of the firſt particular of the firſt part of the text, the Quoter, S. Paul. I have formerly ſpoken of him upon another text: but he deſerveth ſecond and third thoughts. Surely never can be ſaid enough of ſo devout, ſo ſeraphicall, ſo induſtrious, ſo eloquent, ſo learned an Apoſtle. Learned, I ſay, and eloquent: theſe qualities are conſiderable in our preſent purpoſe. As Moſes, the promulger of the Law unto the Jews, was learned in all the learning of the Egyptians; ſo S. Paul, the Preacher of the Goſpel unto the Gentiles, was learned in all the learning of the Heathens. Neither could he well otherwiſe confute them. As one ſaith ſomewhat quaintly of Logick, that we cannot prove it to be unneceſſary, but by it; ſemblably, neither could the Gentiles be refuted in their idolatry, but by the knowledge of them, and the uſe of their knowledge. It is very remarkable, what is ſaid of Apollos in the next chapter and the 24 verſe, that he was λόγιος ἀνὴρ, and δυνατὸς ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς, *an eloquent man, and potent in the Scriptures*, as we reade it.

And an effect and ſucceſſe proportionable to this his abilitie, we have in the laſt verſe; *he mightily convinced the Jews, and that publickly, ſhewing by the Scriptures that Jeſus was the Chriſt.* How did he εὐτόνως διακατηλέγχειν, *mightily confute* them, but by his potencie in the Scriptures? how was he potent in tne Scriptures, but in that he was λόγιος ἀνὴρ? λόγιος, which in the notion of the term may import two things, skill in the words, that he could expound well; and faculcie of ſpeech, that he could expreſſe well his expoſition. Matter and Form do all in nature; matter and form do all in art: our Apoſtle was furniſhed with them both, and abundantly; ſo that he who was to teach the Gentiles Chriſt, might have taught them humane knowledge, might have taught them alſo Rhetorick. Scholarſhip we ſee is not out of date, neither in the times of the Law; for Moſes had it: nor in the times of the Goſpel; for S. Paul expreſſeth it here. Though in reſpect of the glorious and ſun-like light of the holy Scriptures it be but as *ſtramínea candela*, as one ſaith, a ruſh-candle, a mean light, a ſmall light, and ſoon out; yet ſome light it giveth. S. Paul uſeth the mention of the Poets. And thus briefly we paſſe from the Quoter to the Quoted.

And in the quoted we have firſt the manner of ſpeech concerning them, *certain:* And in the manner we obſerved three branches of diſcourſe. Firſt, as it ſoundeth plurality: *certain*, not one onely. Εἰς ἀνὴρ οὐ πάντ' ὁρᾷ: *Bernardus non videt omnia. Two are better then one,* ſaith the Preacher. Multitude of witneſſes maketh an evidence more probable. *Alas, Maſter, what ſhall we do,* ſaith Eliſha's ſervant, when the hoſt of the Syrians environed the city. Eliſha ſoon reſolveth the queſtion; *Fear not: for thoſe*

thoſe that be with us are more then thoſe that be with them, 2. Kings vi. 15, 16. *Exemplatrahunt*, Many draw much. It was a very ſtrange ſpeech of him that ſaid, *Malo errare cum Origene quàm cum aliis vera ſentire:* Extraordinary partiality, to hold with one againſt many, with one erring againſt many having truth on their ſide. Plato ſpeaketh well, Τὸ μὴ αἰσχρὸν αἰσχρὸν ἐὰν φῇς ἢ μὴ φῇς. So truth is truth, ſay it you or ſay it you not, be we more or be we fewer that affirm it: And the reaſon is, Bëcauſe truth is fundamentally in the thing, not in the words. Nevertheleſſe an aſſertion confirmed by many voices ſooner taketh off ſuſpenſion of conſent, ſooner perſwadeth the belief of it. Multiplication of teſtimonies doth not increaſe the truth, yet it increaſeth aſſent. The Church of Rome underſtandeth the virtue of this plurality too well. It is none of the leaſt of her flouriſhes, wherein ſhe ſo bravingly vaunteth, that ſhe hath ever had a world of authoritie for her religion, multitudes of Profeſſours; and that little petty England thruſt up into a corner of the world, enterteineth a religion which now hath not ſo great a number of followers, one century ago and a little more had ſcarce enough to conſerve the ſpecies: *Seculis omnino quindecim non oppidum, non villam, non domum ullam reperiunt ſuâ doctrinâ imbutam.* But we ſhall have a reſtriction for Campian by and by. Before we leave this point of plurality, it is not unworthy of ſome diſquiſition, why our Doctour intimating more ſuffragants then one, yet produceth the teſtimony onely of Aratus: There is none here that bringeth glory to God but this Aratus. I can ſcarce imagine, I dare not pronounce, but that our Apoſtle knew there were more of the Poets of the ſame mind. He could have produced a long liſt of

thoſe authours, all agreeing in the ſame poſition and ſentence: as Homers, ——— πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε.
and Heſiods authoritie,

Ὅν τε διὰ βροτοὶ ἄνδρες ὅμως ἄφατοί τε φατοί τε,
Ῥητοί τ' ἄῤῥητοί τε, Διὸς μεγάλοιο ἕκητι.

Another alſo calleth God Ἀριστοτέχνην, *the beſt Artiſt*, either in generall, in reſpect of the frame of the world; or ſpecially, of mans body. So *Orpheus,

Ζεῦ πολύτιμε, Ζεῦ ἄφθιτε, τὴν δέ τοι ἡμεῖς
Μαρτυρίαν τιθέμεσθα λυτήριον, ἥδε πρόσευξιν.

as if he would make confeſſion of his faith, *O glorious and immortall Jupiter, this teſtimony and expiatory ſupplication we preſent unto thee.*

Ὦ Βασιλεῦ, διὰ σὴν κεφαλὴν ἐφάνη τάδε ῥεῖα·
Γαῖα θεὰ μήτηρ, ὀρέων θ' ὑψήχεες ὄχθοι,
Καὶ πόντος, καὶ πάνθ' ὁπόσ' οὐρανὸς ἐντὸς ἔταξε.

O King, by thy wiſdome were all things eaſily produced; the Earth the ſacred mother, and the high-topped mountains; the ſea, and whatſoever is comprehended under heaven.

Callimachus, ——— τίς κεν Διὸς ἔργματ' ἀείσει;
Χαῖρε πάτερ, χαῖρ' αὖθι.

Who ſhall declare the works of Jupiter? But I will adde no more, leſt I ſhould ſeem to offend againſt S. Pauls example, who balked a number of authours whom he could have cited. Sanctius, an Expoſitour upon my text, is of opinion that he had collected a *ſyllabus*, a roll, a pandect as it were of all the ſentences which the Heathens had ſpoke concerning the immenſitie and power and works of God. Why therefore doth he uſe but one of their authorities? If we may make a conjecturall deſcant where we cannot find a certain demonſtration, happily, firſt he concealed the teſtimonies of the reſt

* Hymno, cui titulus, Διὸς θυμίαμα, Στύρακα.

reſt out of humble modeſty. The Teacher of the Gentiles had learning enough to boaſt of, and reading to glory in, and eloquence to triumph in: and he confeſſeth of himſelf, *I have tongues more then ye all,* 1. Corinth. xiv. 18. and yet he ſeemeth to keep the ſame poſture of humility which our Saviour ſtruck him into when he was in the heat and ruff of perſecution. Many ſtrains of Rhetorick he hath in his Epiſtles, and in the Acts, but all ſubordinate as it were unto the ſtrain of modeſtie; *I knew a man in Chriſt above fourteen years ago,* 2. Cor. xii. 2. When he was to ſpeak of his rapture, how the Apoſtle denieth himſelf, and pronounceth it in a faſhion upon another man, *in tertia perſona*, as if ſo tranſcendent an elevation did not well become him who in his own eſteem deſerved rather to be thrown down below the earth! O excellent grace of Modeſty, ever in ſeaſon but when thy ſelf art to be commended! Modeſtie with ignorance is due and proper: Pride with ignorance is haynous and inſufferable: Learnedneſſe, worth, excellency with modeſtie, is καλὸν καλῶς· nothing ſo amiable, ſo comely, like the coupling of a Muſe and a Grace; ——————*aut, ubi flavo*

Argentum Pariúsve lapis cùm cingitur auro.

As in the clothing of thy reall matter, thy body, ſo in the dreſſing of thy notionall matter, thy diſcourſe, it is very ingenuous to be civill and modeſt, in a kind of negligent handſomeneſſe, or handſome negligence, leſt to avoid nakedneſſe in the one and in the other, thou runneſt εἰς ἑτέραν ἀσχημοσύνην, *into another ſhame*, as an Eccleſiaſtick writer ſpeaketh of flaunting apparell. A faſtuous, affected, ſwelling exerciſe doth at once undo thy commendation, if it be cared for, and the end, which ſhould be.

S. Paul

S. Paul knew more, ſpake leſſe, as was ſaid of an Heathen. He acted his own precept, Rom. xii. 13. φρονῶν εἰς τὸ σωφρονῶν, *to be wiſe unto ſobrietie.*

But ſecondly, I conceive art in this ſobriety, that by the meek concealment of the other authours ſentences he might the more win upon his Auditours, taking off from himſelf the envie of much reading, and in a couchedneſſe granting that they themſelves were very well read in ſuch books, as queſtionleſſe they were, and were not a little (I ſuppoſe) proud of it: the ſcope and end whereof might be, that in his modeſty of himſelf, and reſpective commendation of them, though privately intimated, he might make his perſon more gracious, and conſequently his diſcourſe more acceptable. For as God doth to man; ſo man to man. God firſt accepteth Abels perſon, then his offering: ſo man firſt accepteth mans perſon, then liketh his exhortation. Therefore when a bad man in Rome propounded a good law for the people, the Senate knowing that the naughtineſſe of the perſon would countermand and be prejudiciall unto the virtue of the law, put it into an honeſt mans mouth to be promulged. Rhetorick is an artificiall goodneſſe of the ſpeaker; goodneſſe in the ſpeaker is inartificiall Rhetorick. And the approbation, as it might appear unto the Philoſophers, of their knowingneſſe in this point, might eſpecially work upon them. It is none of the leaſt things which belong unto the facultie of eloquence, reſpectively to take notice of the auditours underſtandingneſſe in the preſent matter of treatiſe. Our S. Paul, I think, one of the beſt Rhetoricians that ever ſpoke, was not ſeldome in this inſinuation: Acts xxiv. 10, 11. unto Felix; and Acts xxvi. 27. unto Agrippa the King, *For the King knoweth*

knoweth of theſe things, before whom alſo I ſpeak freely. For I am perſwaded that none of theſe things are hidden from him: for this thing was not done in a corner. King Agrippa, believeſt thou the Prophets? I know that thou believeſt. as if he would perſwade him into a perſwaſion concerning the Prophets. And the power of this manner of ſpeaking the king himſelf expreſſed: for he ſaith to Paul in the next verſe, *Almoſt thou perſwadeſt me to be a Chriſtian.*

Thirdly, as there was Modeſty in the uſe of but one ſaying of the Heathens, and Art in that modeſty, ſo was there alſo (I conceive) Diſcretion in that art. It was a mixt audience, as we may ſuppoſe in ſuch a ſolemn place, and as we may gather by the laſt verſe of this chapter, wherein there is mention made of Damaris and many others, beſides Dionyſius the Areopagite, who were converted by that diſpute. Now a large enumeration of a beadroll of Poets and of their ſentences had been out of queſtion loſt unto the meaner of the aſſembly, which like little fiſhes uſually bite more then the greater. Rationall ſouls are all equall; (and the reaſon is, becauſe they are not *ex traduce*, but from God) as God ſaith himſelf, Ezek. xviii. 4. *Behold all ſouls are mine: As the ſoul of the father, ſo alſo the ſoul of the ſonne is mine. The ſoul that ſinneth, it ſhall die.* And as God here ſignifieth a generall care of ſouls, without any different reſpect; ſo that he will not puniſh the ſonne for the fathers fault, but the ſoul that ſinneth it ſhall die: ſo the Apoſtle would not have the meaner ſort to be puniſhed with hearing ſo much which they underſtood not, becauſe the Philoſophers were better read. The puniſhment of the ignorant, Plato ſaith, is to learn of the wiſe: but then it muſt not be the untowardneſſe of the Teacher not to

condeſcend unto the capacitie of the illiterate. Mixt aſſemblies require at leaſt mixt diſcourſes; that the plainer form may win the plainer ſort, the learneder the learneder.

But neither doth our Doctour ſay *all the Poets*, as he might unto the Philoſophers, though he had produced the teſtimonie but of one. Here we have a reſtriction; *certain*, not all, not many. And this is the ſecond conſiderable in τινὲς. With a fairer ingenuity doth our Diſputant proceed in his diſcourſe then ſome Athenians in theirs, who having found the ſuffrage of one or two Fathers, or Schoolmen, or Expoſitours, or of any other order, take their writing and ſet down *all*: much like the fellow who having read an obſcure Authour, and being asked his judgement of him, replied, Ἃ σωῖνκα καλά· καὶ ἃ μὴ σωῖνκα, ὡς δίμαι, *That which I underſtood is good; and ſo is that which I underſtood not, as I ſuppoſe*: So, thoſe which they have read ſay ſo; and ſo do the reſt, they ſuppoſe. With very good confidence might S. Paul have ſpoke in a catholick form, in a full univerſalitie, the *theſis* being at firſt imprinted in them, as men; and therefore the matter was neceſſary: yet he ſpeaketh in a mortall number, in a paucity; *certain*. Now certain are ſufficient to make an evidence. Μάρτυς γὰρ πρὸς καὶ εἷς χρήσιμος, as Ariſtotle in the ſecond book of his Rhetoricks: even one good witneſſe is conſiderable. *At the mouth of two witneſſes, or at the mouth of three witneſſes ſhall the matter be eſtabliſhed*, Deut. xix. 15. May Rome then be a little more moderate in her brags of multitude of Profeſſours, of ſwarms of her Catholicks. The *Species* may be conſerved in one *Individuum*: A few are enough to make a being of religion; though not a flouriſhing viſibility, which is no way eſſentiall unto

to the truth of a Church. And very good authority may be brought for the proving that in every century ſince Chriſt we have had ſome or other, more or fewer, who have mainteined the greateſt parts of the Proteſtants moſt important and fundamentall opinions, whatſoever Campian prattleth. And let them enjoy their multitude. Surely it is not like to be good friendſhip which is amongſt very many: and the reaſon is very good, as he in his Ethicks, Ὀλίγοι γὰρ οἱ ἀγαθοί, *For there are very few truly good:* So the religion may be ſuſpected whereof ſo many are ſtudious, becauſe there are ſo few truly religious. Moreover, Number belonging unto Quantitie, which iſſueth from the wombe of Matter, by ſequele of a proportionable effect, muſt be as dull, as uneffectuall as its mother, and skilleth as little to any importance, being in it ſelf indifferent, or rather of the two ſuppoſing weakneſſe. Multitude is of little uſe in nature, but where there is deficiency: and therefore ſome would have every angel to be a diſtinct *ſpecies*, becauſe plurality of *Individuums* under a *ſpecies* is onely by reaſon of their mortality; which is not competible to angels. Certainly a ſtrange canvaſe it would be, wherein truth ſhould go by voices, and be judged by the poll as it were of free-holders. *Non tam autoritatis in diſputando, quàm rationis momenta quærenda ſunt*, as Tully in his firſt *De natura Deorum.* Diſputations are to have more reaſon in them then authority. But if Rome will yet glory in number, let her glory in the ſeptenary number of her hills, ſpoken of in the deſcription of Antichriſt, Rev. xvii. 9. let her glorie in the criticall number of the Beaſt ıɔcLxvı, which the numerall letters of Λατῖνος (that ſignifieth their nation) do amount unto; let her glory in the title of univerſall

Biſhop, which Gregory predeceſſour to Boniface (who firſt uſurped the appellation)affirmed to be an antecedent ſigne of Antichriſt: As for us, we are not aſhamed of our paucitie in the times of their perſecutions: *The gleaning of Ephraim is better then the vintage of Abiezer.* Veritie hath its exſiſtence, though there were never a man in the world to own it: and Falſity will be nothing, though all the men in the world maintein it. Humane teſtimonies are but probable arguments. Many are better for the multitude: fewer are ſufficient for the wiſer ſort. So the Apoſtle, *certain*; not one onely: *certain*; not all,not many.

Thirdly, we have in this manner of ſpeech a certain diſreſpectiveneſſe, without ſo much as naming the Quoted: τινὲς, confuſedly: neither Who nor What: neither welt nor gard; plain *Certain*. Not

——————ἔπος τ' ἔφατ', ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε;

Did he not ſo much as call them by their names? No ſurely our Apoſtle mentioned them rather for his own uſe then for their credit; to ſhame the Philoſophers practice, rather then to honour the Poets ſayings. There is not (as ye know) the name of a great learned Heathen man in all the holy book of God, neither Poet, nor Philoſopher, nor Hiſtorian, nor Oratour. Where is Homer, either in Greek,for whom ſeverall nations contended to honour themſelves with ſuch a countreyman? or where is Homer in Latine (as he is called) Virgil, the ſtately Poet? Where is Alexanders Tutour, Ariſtotle, though the Patriarch of Philoſophy, as one termeth him? Where is Seneca, the divine Moraliſt, whatever Salmeron feigneth of letters which he wrote to S. Paul, and S. Paul again to him, the matter whereof, he ſaith,is not much unlike that of S.John to the Elect Lady, and to Gaius,

Gaius, or that of S. Paul to Philemon? Where is Plato, whom Zanchy ſuppoſeth to have read the books of Moſes? In Tullie's Hortenſius S. Auguſtine could find nothing of Chriſt: In the Chriſtians book there is none of Tully. We have mention of Philippi, but of no Philippick; not the divine one, as Juvenal calleth it. Ὅυτος ὁ Δημοσθένης πῦ κεῖται; where do we find the grave oratour of Greece, Demoſthenes? yet would not the Doctour of the Gentiles, who ſaid that he magnified his office, vouchſafe ſo farre as to name thoſe Authours whoſe ſayings he is pleaſed to inſert into ſacred Scripture, and by his conſecration of them to make them more divine then any of Plato's works; neither Aratus, nor Menander, nor Epimenides, nor any other, if there be any other, whoſe ſentences he borroweth? Was it the wiſdome and policie of this Teacher of the Gentiles to leave their names out on purpoſe, that ſo he might ingage us to the reading over of the Greek Poets, as if we ſhould find in them ſome great matter worthy of our pains? Or did he well remember the ſpeeches, but forgat the Authours names? or had he not his books and parchments about him? or could he not in that *ex-tempore* diſpute look in them? One would have thought he might have named Aratus, though none elſe, if it were but for his beginning, the piety of his beginning, Ἐκ Διὸς ἀρχώμεσθα———, *Let us begin from God*, as S. Paul expoundeth him; or for the continuation of his devotion, ——τὸν οὐδέποτ' ἄνδρες ἐῶμεν

Ἄῤῥητον. μεσταὶ δὲ Διὸς πᾶσαι μὲν ἀγυιαὶ,

Πᾶσαι δ' ἀνθρώπων ἀγοραί.——

Let us never ceaſe to extoll him. Every ſtreet, every aſſembly aboundeth with him.; or again, for the divineneſſe of his ſubject, the heavens, more ſublime and pure matter then

uſeth to be in the wanton and obſcene pages of ſome other Poets. We have indeed in the laſt verſe of this chapter mention of Dionyſius; and leſt the honour ſhould miſcarry upon another of the ſame name, for diſtinction, *the Areopagite*, Διονύσιος ὁ Ἀρεοπαγίτης. Θεωδίδης Ἀθηναῖος. But firſt happily this Dionyſius was no very great learned man. As for that ſaying which is received as his, at the paſſion of our Saviour, *Either the God of nature ſuffereth, or the world will be diſſolved*, me thinketh it was no argument of any extraordinary knowledge, it being eaſie for them to know that the eclipſe then was ſupernaturall, it being not then conjunction-time of ſunne and moon, and alſo in regard of the continuance of the eclipſe, as Thomas Aquinas obſerveth. Upon this ſaying alſo is conjectured that he cauſed the conſecration of an altar to the Unknown God, which S. Paul ſpeaketh of. But whether he was the authour of this is very doubtfull, if not improbable: For they had more anciently an altar inſcribed UNTO THE UNKNOWN GODS, which Pauſanias maketh mention of in his fifth book, Πρὸς αὐτῷ δ' ἐστὶν Ἀγνώστων θεῶν βωμός. And concerning the books which the Pontificians father upon his name, *De cæleſti hierarchia*, *De eccleſiaſtica hierarchia*, *De Divinis nominibus*, it were not very difficult to determine them not to be his. For Hierome in his Catalogue of Eccleſiaſtick writers maketh no mention of them. Valla and Eraſmus have proved by many arguments that they are none of his, as Chemnitius relateth. And in his Eccleſiaſtick Hierarchy he ſpeaketh of Temples, of Altars, of Monks, whereof in Dionyſius the Areopagites time, whom S. Paul converted, certainly there was no being. In his fifth chapter *De eccleſiaſtica hierarchia* we have them

them in a manner all in one line; Ὁμὲν ἱερεὺς ἕστηκεν ἐπίπροσθε τοῦ θείου θυσιαστηρίου τὴν μοναχικὴν ἐπίκλησιν ἱερολογῶν, *The Prieſt ſtanding before the Altar chanteth out ſome monaſticall invocation.* Where the Altar is and the Prieſt the Temple may be ſuppoſed. Now ſettled temples in Dionyſius his time, almoſt certain it is, there were none: Queſtionleſſe no Monks, the order whereof was inſtituted firſt by Paul the Hermite ſome two hundred and ſeven years after the converſion of Dionyſius, as the Chronologer hath it. Dionyſius then who is named in Scripture was no very learned ſcholar, for ought we know. But ſecondly, if ſo; ſurely he was a Chriſtian before he had the honour to be mentioned in the book of God. God, I ſee, reſpecteth not excellencie of learning where there is no meaſure of grace: but he reſpecteth the leaſt degree of grace in whatſoever perſon: Damaris is named with Denys; a woman with an Areopagite. O Chriſtianitie, that either findeſt us or makeſt us honourable, yea oftener makeſt us then findeſt us ſo, yea ever makeſt us, yea never findeſt us of any reall worth, onely in a ſhew and ἐν φαντασίᾳ! Untill we come to be Chriſtians we are not worthy the naming. Silly were the Heathen, who knew not this religion: impious they were for hating it; unjuſt, for hating they knew not what: as Tertullian in his Apologeticus, *Vacante meriti notitiâ unde odii juſtitia defenditur.*[1] Though it was ſometimes a ſtranger on earth, and none would own it, yet it had *genus, ſpem, gratiam & dignitatem in cœlis*, as the ſame Father. Very reſpectively doth Scripture ſpeak of religious Chriſtians. The Bereans were *more noble then thoſe of Theſſalonica*, in the ſeventh verſe of this chapter; *more noble*, εὐγενέστεροι, as it were of better deſcent, which is, as we may ſpeak, the very bloud of Nobility.

But

But how more noble? *Non per civilem dignitatem ſed ſpiritualem dignationem:* It is ſubjoyned, *in that they received the word with all readineſſe of mind, and ſearched* (not the records of their antiquity, but) *the Scripture daily whether thoſe things were ſo.* And whereas in the next verſe the Scripture mentioneth *honourable women*; happily they are ſaid to be honourable in way of a *Prolepſis*, as being to be believers. Nevertheleſſe alſo, if I ſeem not ſomewhat too criticall, we may obſerve that thoſe in the former verſe have the better term in the notion of the originall: Theſe are εὐσχήμονες, women *of good faſhion*; the other εὐγενέστεροι, *more noble.* Not as if the honour of every ones place were forfeited by the badneſſe of the perſon in an humane ſociety: but thus it is with God. Plato commendeth the Attick countrey, διὰ τὸ αὐτόχθονας εἶναι τοὺς ἐνοικοῦντας. and Thucydides more plainly in the beginning, ſpeaking of the ſame countrey, ſaith, Ἄνθρωποι ᾤκουν ἐν αὐτῇ ἀεί, *The ſame men ever inhabited it:* not as if they were immortall, but the ſame of nation: it was the mother and nurſe to them all in his opinion. By the way, that is falſe, as may be demonſtrated out of the twenty ſixth verſe of this chapter, where God is ſaid to *have made of one bloud* (that is, of one man, Adam) *all men to dwell upon all the face of the earth.* From one Adam were derived all mankind, which after the confuſion of Babel ſeverally diſperſed themſelves throughout the earth: ſo that thoſe who firſt inhabited the Attick countrey were not born there, as Plato ſuppoſeth; nor did the ſame men ever inhabit it, as may be ſuppoſed, men of other languages very likely mingling themſelves after that diſperſion. Yet if ſo, as Plato and Thucydides would have it, it would be no commendation to that which followeth in Plato,

Plato, as himſelf confeſſeth, τὸ πρῶτον καὶ μέγιστον, *The firſt and greateſt is*, ὅτι τυγχάνει οὖσα θεοφιλής, either actively or paſſively, either *loving of God*, or *beloved of God*: They go both together. *Meats commend us not to God*, as S. Paul: ſo neither nation, nor whatſoever other ſecular reſpect and qualitie. Nor doth he like what he is himſelf Authour of in a ſubject which is not ſuch as it ſhould be. Wit and Eloquence, and Erudition are Gods creatures; yet doth he not vouchſafe them a power to move his delight, unleſſe they be exerciſed to his glory. *Melior eſt humilis ruſticus qui Deo ſervit, quàm ſuperbus Philoſophus qui neglecto ſeipſo cœli motum contemplatur*, as a devout Dominicane. The Greeks expreſſe learning and goodneſſe in one word: Σπουδαῖος is for both; as if they were not learned who are not good. So Φιλοσοφεῖν is uſually underſtood by S. Chryſoſtome for Action: and the Scripture calleth a wicked man generally *a fool*.

Now in this mean eſteem of humane knowledge without divine goodneſſe we are the more fit to paſſe over briefly the Poets without envying them. And this is the next particular according to our diviſion, the Profeſſion of the Quoted, *Poets*. What ſhall I call them? reall men of an imaginary world, or imaginative men of a reall world? who, as if nature were not fruitfull enough to bring forth reall entities, muſt multiply to the world a new brood of things which live onely in a phanſie. Plutarch calleth Poetry μερίδα τῶν Μουσῶν, *a part of the Muſes*, or a piece of learning; Simonides, ζωγραφίαν λαλοῦσαν, *a ſpeaking picture*; Plato, μίμησιν, *an imitation*. Plato is ſaid to have baniſhed them out of his Common-wealth; Proclus upon Plato giveth us the reaſons; Ἔοικε γὰρ, μιμητικῆς ἁπάσης οὔσης τῆς τῶν ποιημάτων πραγματείας, &c. Since Poetrie is an imi-

tation, according to Plato, and the ſubjects whoſe lives and actions they imitate, being the gods, and the *Heroes* their ſonnes, the Poets not knowing certainly what they did, but ſuppoſing they lived in pleaſure, phanſied unto them ſuch pleaſure as men then or themſelves delighted in: juſt as Euſebius ſaith of Cerinthus, that he held that our Saviours kingdome after the reſurrection ſhould be voluptuary, becauſe he himſelf delighted ſo much in carnall pleaſure. So that the Poets did not onely attribute unto them ſuch things as were merely humane, as Eating, Sleeping, and the like, but ſuch alſo as are againſt reaſon, as Intemperance, Adultery, and the like. Whence Cyrill of Hieruſalem mocketh the Heathens for calling Jupiter an adulterer, a God; Εἰ μοιχὸς ὁ Ζεὺς, θεὸς μὴ καλείσθω, *If he be an adulterer, let him not be called a God.* Plato now ſeeing the ingagement unto vice by theſe examples (as the fellow in Terence, *Ego verò feci & lubens*; He braggeth what he had done in imitation of Jupiter) was provoked for this cauſe to remove them. Secondly, becauſe it was not meet that ſuch obſcene borborologie and filthy ſpeeches as they uſed ſhould proceed out of the mouth of man. The words are good; Οὐ γὰρ ἡγοῦνται χρῆναι μολύνειν τὴν γλῶτταν, ὄργανον οὖσαν τοῦ θεῶν ὑμνῳδίας καὶ τῆς πρὸς τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς συνουσίας, διὰ τῆς τῶν φθέγξεως, *It is not to be thought fit that the tongue, the inſtrument of Gods praiſe, and of conference with good men, ſhould be ſoiled and polluted with ſuch ſpeeches.* Nevertheleſſe he doth not abſolutely condemne them: For in the beginning of the eighth of his Laws he preſcribeth what kind of poemes are to be uſed in a ſolemnity, & the qualification of the Poets; and himſelf now and then uſeth their ſayings. Our Apoſtle S. Paul, Tit. i. 12. where he quoteth Epimenides his ſaying, calleth the Poets

Poets *Prophets*; Εἰπέ τις ἐξ αὐτῶν ἴδιος αὐτῶν προφήτης: whereby he seemeth to expresse the nature of the profession in a way of resemblance; and that may be two wayes, either *ratione personæ*, or *ratione officii*. First, *Ratione personæ*, in two respects, either as accounted by common esteem as Prophets, or by great ones honoured like them. As Jeremiah, xxxix. 11. was honoured by the king of Babylon, so were Poets respected by kings, and were familiar unto them, as Pausanias writeth; Συνῆσαν δὲ καὶ τότε τοῖς βασιλεῦσιν οἱ ποιηταί: with Polycrates Anacreon, with Antigonus our Aratus. Secondly, there is a resemblance of Poets with Prophets *ratione officii*, and that three wayes: either 1. in regard of dictation of their poemes; so that as the Prophets were inspired by God for the penning of their prophecies, so the Poets were accounted to have been inspired in their poetries. Whence Plato saith of them in the third of his Laws, Θεῖον οὖν δὴ καὶ τὸ ποιητικὸν, ἐνθεαστικὸν ὂν γένος, *The generation of the Poets is a divine and inspired generation*. Or 2. in regard of their style. The Prophets of God spake in a high style and strain, hyperbolically, obscurely, as Ezekiel; (and therefore the Jews forbad Ezekiel to be read before the thirtieth yeare; whence that is called *annus sacerdotalis*, the Priests yeare, besides other reasons:) so also did the Poets, as might be shown. 3. In regard of their end. The Prophets, as they are taken largely were rebukers of sinne, and exhorters unto godlinesse: (although, *ut sic*, the proper denomination is from *Prediction*, foretelling:) This also was the peculiar office and scope of the Satyrists amongst the Poets: and the very worst of them now and then gave virtue a commendation, and vice a censure.

But now out of S. Pauls use and expression of

them, what deduction, what inference, what corollary ſhall we raiſe? That they promiſcuouſly are to be read? or if the choice ones, much? or if ſparingly, at times, with immoderate delight? Nay, ſhall we at all reade them? Shall Plato baniſh them, Chriſtians uſe them? I would Chriſtians did not uſe ſome things which Heathens forbid. Ariſtotle in the fourth of his Ethicks the firſt chapter, and in one page, condemneth both τοκιστὴν and κυβευτὴν, *the uſurer* and *the dicer*; and yet ſome Chriſtians bluſh at neither. Plutarch paſſeth a determination upon Poetrie, Ἓν μὲν κακὸν, ἓν δὲ καὶ ἐσθλόν. And ſurely *plus aloes quàm mellis habet:* There is picking work enough. Yet as Virgil being asked what he meant when he read Ennius, replied that he did *è cœno colligere margaritas*; ſo if a Chriſtian did reade Virgil, he might, being asked the ſame queſtion, anſwer in the ſame manner. Or if from this hint of Poets we ſhould riſe to a generall diſcourſe of humane authours, as the fellow that was asked whether light was pleaſant, ſaid, It was a blind mans queſtion; ſo if it ſhould be asked, Whether humane knowledge were uſefull, it might be anſwered, It is an illiterate queſtion. Certainly there is ſome good to be gotten in the ſtudy of Greek authours, or elſe Julian the Apoſtate would never have interdicted to the Chriſtian youth the uſe of them. Nicephorus in his tenth book of Eccleſiaſticall hiſtory bringeth in Julians reaſon why he forbad the uſe of Greek authours, *Nè linguis eorum acumine perpolitis facilè diſputatoribus noſtris reſiſtere, & ſacra quidem ſua amplificare, religionem autem noſtram refellere facilè queant.* I might now tell you Nicephorus his arguments for the point, and that Baſil hath wrote a book to this purpoſe; and I might tell you what S. Auguſtine ſaith concerning

cerning this in the end of his ſecond *De doctrina Chriſtiana*, and what others, and how learned the Fathers were, and that S. Paul after converſion did not burn his books nor parchments: But it is an errour to bring this into queſtion in an Univerſitie. In lieu of all arguments this may ſerve, that in this diſpute of S. Paul, where he uſeth both Philoſophy and Poets, a woman, Damaris, and many others, likely not of the learned nation, were converted.

From hence alſo the Teacher of the Gentiles inſtructeth us Chriſtians not to diſembrace goodneſſe in any, nor truth in any. Plato's rule is good, Οὐ τίς, ἀλλὰ τί. Let us not conſider ſo much who ſaith, as what is ſaid; who doeth, as what is done. Let not the authority of the teacher tempt thee to erre; as Vincentius Lirinenſis ſaith, the errours of the Fathers were temptations to the Church: nor let the badneſſe or meanneſſe of the preacher ſpoil thy attention. Learn not badneſſe of the beſt; but learn goodneſſe of the worſt.

Laſtly, me thinketh from hence we may raiſe a meditation upon an embleme of the ſtrangeneſſe of the happineſſe of the Gentiles being received into grace. As unlikely as Poets ſayings were to be made canonicall, were Gentiles to be made divine: As unlikely as an Heathens ſaying to be put in the book of truth, was an Heathens name to be wrote in the book of life. *The Heathen are come into thine inheritance, O God,* may be ſung now with joy, as it was ſometimes by David with complaint. And ſo much of the Profeſſion of the Quoted, *Poets.*

Nextly followeth the Appropriation of them; YOUR OWN *Poets: As certain alſo of* YOUR OWN *Poets have ſaid,* Τῶν ΚΑΘ' ΥΜΑΣ ποιητῶν, or Ποιητῶν τῶν ΚΑΘ' ΥΜΑΣ. S. Paul

maketh uſe of their writings, but rejecteth them; he approveth what they ſay, but he owneth not them: YOUR OVVN *Poets*. They bring their gift unto the altar, and then go their way. One or two reade it *veſtratium*, in reference unto their countrey. But that is very diſputable in two reſpects; of the thing, and of the phraſe. For the firſt, though we know not what countreymen they were whom S. Paul includeth in the CERTAIN, and therefore cannot judge whether they were conterraneous unto the Epicureans and Stoicks, yet we know what Aratus was, whom he uſeth in the place; even S. Pauls own countreyman, as may be gathered out of Pauſanias in the place forementioned: where ſpeaking of thoſe Poets which were familiar unto kings, he ſaith, καὶ Ἀντιγόνῳ Μακεδόνων ἄρχοντι Ἀντιπάτρας Ῥόδιος, καὶ Σολεὺς Ἄρατος, *There lived with Antigonus king of the Macedonians, Antagoras of Rhodes, and Aratus of Soli a city in Cilicia.* S. Paul was of Tarſus a city of Cilicia, as himſelf witneſſeth Acts xxi. 39. Now that thoſe Epicureans and Stoicks were all Cilicians, is very improbable. Secondly, neither is that expoſition likely in reſpect of the notion of the phraſe; κατ' ὑμᾶς being very ſeldome, perhaps never read in that ſenſe without ſome other connotation of locality. We may therefore (*ſalvo meliori judicio*) interpret κατὰ here as it is uſed Coloſſ. iii. 10. κατὰ τὸν εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος, *according to*, or *in ſimilitude of, the image of him that created*; or as it is uſed Acts xxvi. 3. πάντων τῶν κατὰ Ἰουδαίους ἐθῶν, where it importeth a correſpondence in diſcipline: ſo here τῶν κατ' ὑμᾶς ποιητῶν, Poets concluded under the ſame ſect of Heatheniſme; and that is a generall habitude and likeneſſe of the Poets unto the Epicureans and Stoicks, as Heathens: or ſecondly, YOUR OVVN *Poets*, τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς, by a particular reference

rence and diſtinct agreement in your ſeverall ſects, as queſtioning Providence upon every ſeeming diſorder and ataxie of ſecular events, that thoſe that are virtuous are oppreſſed with wrong, thoſe that are lewd are full of all proſperity, that offenders have not preſently their condigne puniſhment: Thus the Poets were Epicureans. And again, ſome of them held that all things did proceed according to a neceſſary connexion of cauſes and effects, which, being once ſet, the Gods themſelves could not alter: ſo Homer and Horace amongſt others, as might be ſhown: And theſe were in likeneſſe of opinion Stoicks. Heathens then however the Poets were; ſo theirs, the Philoſophers. Poets; yet κατ' ὑμᾶς. Prophets; yet *yours*. As being rationall, ſo S. Pauls: as learned, ſo S. Pauls: as Poets, ſo happily S. Pauls, in regard at leaſt of his uſe of them: Aratus a Cilician, ſo S. Pauls. Rationall, but no more; no faith: κατ' ὑμᾶς: Learned, not good: κατ' ὑμᾶς: Poets, Prophets, but Heathens: κατ' ὑμᾶς: Aratus, his countreyman, but not from above; κατ' ὑμᾶς. His ſaying is taken; he left. We have two leſſons from hence.

1. Good ſpeeches make us not good. Word and Work are two things. It is an eaſie matter for our ſaying to be better then our doing. Sermocination in the moſt exact complement and perfection of it, by Congruity, by Truth, by Ornament, which Bonaventure requireth unto a ſpeech perfect in it ſelf; or let there be added in regard of the end (as the ſame Bonaventure) good Expreſſion, good Information, Moving; yet it neither perſwadeth in the hearer of it ſelf, nor proveth in the ſpeaker a reall virtue. Underſtanding and affection are remote of themſelves: grace is in both. Some live ill, ſpeak well; ſome do

maketh uſe of their writings, but rejecteth them; he approveth what they ſay, but he owneth not them: YOUR OVVN *Poets*. They bring their gift unto the altar, and then go their way. One or two reade it *veſtratium*, in reference unto their countrey. But that is very diſputable in two reſpects; of the thing, and of the phraſe. For the firſt, though we know not what countreymen they were whom S. Paul includeth in the CERTAIN, and therefore cannot judge whether they were conterraneous unto the Epicureans and Stoicks, yet we know what Aratus was, whom he uſeth in the place; even S. Pauls own countreyman, as may be gathered out of Pauſanias in the place forementioned: where ſpeaking of thoſe Poets which were familiar unto kings, he ſaith, καὶ Ἀντιγόνῳ Μακεδόνων ἄρχοντι Ἀντιγόρας Ῥόδιος, καὶ Σολεῦσι Ἄρατος, *There lived with Antigonus king of the Macedonians, Antagoras of Rhodes, and Aratus of Soli a city in Cilicia.* S. Paul was of Tarſus a city of Cilicia, as himſelf witneſſeth Acts xxi. 39. Now that thoſe Epicureans and Stoicks were all Cilicians, is very improbable. Secondly, neither is that expoſition likely in reſpect of the notion of the phraſe; καθ' ὑμᾶς being very ſeldome, perhaps never read in that ſenſe without ſome other connotation of locality. We may therefore (*ſalvo meliori judicio*) interpret κατὰ here as it is uſed Coloſſ. iii. 10. κατὰ τὸν εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος, *according to*, or *in ſimilitude of, the image of him that created*; or as it is uſed Acts xxvi. 3. πάντων τῶν κατὰ Ἰουδαίους ἐθῶν, where it importeth a correſpondence in diſcipline: ſo here τῶν καθ' ὑμᾶς ποιητῶν, Poets concluded under the ſame ſect of Heatheniſme; and that is a generall habitude and likeneſſe of the Poets unto the Epicureans and Stoicks, as Heathens: or ſecondly, YOUR OVVN *Poets*, τῶν ΚΑΘ' ΗΜΑΣ, by a particular reference

rence and distinct agreement in your severall sects, as questioning Providence upon every seeming disorder and ataxie of secular events, that those that are virtuous are oppressed with wrong, those that are lewd are full of all prosperity, that offenders have not presently their condigne punishment: Thus the Poets were Epicureans. And again, some of them held that all things did proceed according to a necessary connexion of causes and effects, which, being once set, the Gods themselves could not alter: so Homer and Horace amongst others, as might be shown: And these were in likenesse of opinion Stoicks. Heathens then however the Poets were; so theirs, the Philosophers. Poets; yet καθ' ὑμᾶς. Prophets; yet *yours*. As being rationall, so S. Pauls: as learned, so S. Pauls: as Poets, so happily S. Pauls, in regard at least of his use of them: Aratus a Cilician, so S. Pauls. Rationall, but no more; no faith: καθ' ὑμᾶς: Learned, not good: καθ' ὑμᾶς: Poets, Prophets, but Heathens: καθ' ὑμᾶς: Aratus, his countreyman, but not from above; καθ' ὑμᾶς. His saying is taken; he left. We have two lessons from hence.

1. Good speeches make us not good. Word and Work are two things. It is an easie matter for our saying to be better then our doing. Sermocination in the most exact complement and perfection of it, by Congruity, by Truth, by Ornament, which Bonaventure requireth unto a speech perfect in it self; or let there be added in regard of the end (as the same Bonaventure) good Expression, good Information, Moving; yet it neither perswadeth in the hearer of it self, nor proveth in the speaker a reall virtue. Understanding and affection are remote of themselves: grace is in both. Some live ill, speak well; some do

do neither; ſome do both. We are in a mighty errour and in a deep ignorance, if we think (as the Gnoſticks) to be ſaved for our knowing or ſpeaking onely the truth. If we would be Chriſts diſciples, we muſt do what he commandeth us. Aratus ſaid well here: yet he is none of Chriſts diſciples; S. Paul rejecteth him: YOUR OVVN *Poets.*

2. Learn we then ſecondly, to give every one his due, and not to believe vain words, empty words. The profeſſion of the truth onely maketh not a true and ſolid profeſſour. S. Paul in the main caſteth off theſe Poets, and ſorteth them with their own, Poets with Epicureans, and Poets with Stoicks. Epicureans and Stoicks, they differed amongſt themſelves, they agreed in idolatrous Heatheniſme. As there is a civill juſtice in giving every man his due in a temporall and ſecular eſtate, ſo is there alſo an eccleſiaſticall juſtice in giving every man his due in a ſpirituall eſtate: and to a delinquency in this alſo God denounceth a wo Eſay v. 20. *Wo unto them that call evil good, and good evil.* Take we heed that we make neither Cenſures whip nor Charities cloke too long: we may offend in both. Surely through want of charity in being, and through too much in thinking, God hath not his own. If the Teacher of the Gentiles had flattered thoſe Athenians, and had accounted them a great deal better men then the Poets, had he reckoned them amongſt true worſhippers, had he made them of the Church and not ſtrangers from God in reſpect of the right way of ſerving him, Dionyſius likely, who was one of them, out of a good opinion of himſelf had continued in his Paganiſme, and had not been converted unto Chriſtianity. Theſe Philoſophers then and Poets are not acknowled-

ged

ged here to be of the Church visible: and whether they or any of them be members of the Church invisible, of the Church triumphant, now, God knoweth. I am not here ingaged to speak definitively of their eternall condition: But if I were, I should first in equity do that which yet they would not do in the primitive times to Christians, namely, heare what they could say for themselves in the next part of my text, the Form of quoting, *AS certain also of your own Poets have said,* ὡς εἰρήκασι, *AS they said.*

The Ὡς implyeth a similitude of their saying unto Divine truth. And it is not amisse to see what the twilight of humane reason can see of God, and towards God, and what analogy there is betwixt some of their speeches and some of Scripture. And by this discourse, we finding in it no mention of the formall object of Christianity, may perceive how little knowledge they had of it: yet they have spoken very fairly. I know not how it cometh to passe, but too many Christians have too much of Heathen talk: And so also in a reciprocation, some Heathen have very much of that which seemeth correspondent unto sacred Scripture. To omit many fictions of the Poets, which are little else then fabulous histories, allusions unto reall things before the floud, as if in a manner they would redeem the losse of the history of the old world; as also to omit how the names of their Heathen gods may seem to relate unto true men in those times: Were it Moses, or were it David (one saith Moses, another David) who said that *the dayes of our age are threescore years and ten*, Psal. xc. 10. Solon jumpeth upon the very same number, as Diogenes Laertius speaketh of him in his Life, Σόλων δὲ ὅρον ἀνθρωπίνου βίου φησὶν ἔτη ἑβδομή-

κοντα, *Solon saith that the term of a mans life is seventy years.* Plutarch saith in the Life of Numa, Θεὸς οὐκ ἔστι φίλιππος, *God is not a lover of horses:* Psal. cxlvii. 10. *He delighteth not in the strength of an horse.*

Αἶψα γὰρ ἐν κακότητι βροτοὶ καταγηράσκουσι,

saith Hesiod in his ἔργα καὶ ἡμ. Jacob to Pharaoh interpreteth the verse (as we may speak) *Few and evil have been the dayes of my pilgrimage.* Matth. vii. 14. *Narrow is the way which leadeth unto life,* Τεθλιμμένη ἡ ὁδός: Hesiod saith the like of Virtue,

——— ὄρθιος τίμος ἐπ' αὐτὴν
Καὶ τρηχὺς τὸ πρῶτον.

and a little before, to Vice it is ὀλίγη ὁδός, *a little way to it;*

——— μάλα δ' ἐγγύθι ναίει,

It dwelleth hard by. Our Saviour, John xix. 27. to his beloved disciple S. John, Ἰδοὺ ἡ μήτηρ σου, *Behold thy mother:* Σοὶ ταύτην δίδωμι τὴν μητέρα, *I give thee this woman for thy mother,* was the speech of the Samians, when to the richer of the citizens the mothers of those who died in the warres were given to be mainteined by them. And did not our Saviour die for S. John? 1. Tim. v. 6. S. Paul speaking of a widow which liveth in pleasure, saith, Ἡ δὲ γυνὴ σπεταλῶσα ζῶσα τέθνηκε, *She that liveth in pleasure is dead while she liveth. Talis vita nunquid vita erat, Domine?* but that is S. Augustines, speaking of a licentious life; *Lord, what a life was that?* But Terence in Hecyra cometh nearer;

Sanè hercle homo voluptati obsequens
Fuit dum vixit.

Pamphilus speaketh it there of a woman too. S. Pauls Greek cannot well be rendred but by Terence's Latine, and Terence's Latine cannot be put wel into other Greek. Aristotle, *Rhet. ii. c. 23.* Ἐκ τοῦ νόμου τοῦ θεοδέκτου, τοῖς κακῶς ἐπιμελη-

θεῖσι

θεῖσι τῶν ἀλλοτρίων ἵππων ἢ παρεδίδουν τοὺς οἰκείους, *Those that looked not well to other mens horses, by Theodectes his law were not to have their own given them*: Like unto this may that of our Saviour seem, Luke xvi. 12. *And if ye have not been faithfull in that which is another mans, who shall give you that which is your own?* Æsop being asked by Chilo, one of the seven wisemen of Greece, what God was doing, answered, Τὰ μὲν ὑψηλὰ ταπεινοῦν, τὰ δὲ ταπεινὰ ὑψοῦν: and Psalm cxlvii. 6. *The Lord setteth up the meek, and bringeth the ungodly down to the ground*, ταπεινοῖ: as if one place had been taken from the other. Ἐγὼ μὲν ἐπίσταμαι ἀδικεῖσθαι, saith Chilo to his brother, who took it ill that he was not chosen to be one of the Judges: Οἶδα ταπεινοῦσθαι, saith S. Paul, *I know how to be abased*. One of Chilo's precepts (as appeareth in the Life of Chilo by Diogenes Laertius) was, τῆς αὐτοῦ οἰκίας καλῶς προστατεῖν, *To rule ones own house well*: S. Paul 1. Tim. v. 4. hath the same precept in effect, τὸν ἴδιον οἶκον εὐσεβεῖν: but more patly chap. iii. vers. 12. where he speaketh of the qualification of Deacons, τέκνων καλῶς προϊστάμενοι καὶ τῶν ἰδίων οἴκων, *ruling their children, and their own houses well*. Moses, Exod. iii. when he was to be sent to the children of Israel by God, desired to know Gods name, that he might tell them who sent him; and God expressed himself by I AM: *Thus thou shalt say unto the children of Israel*, I AM *hath sent me unto you*, vers. 14. So Plato calleth God τὸ ὄν, *that which is*; and τὸ ὂν ὄντως, *that which is indeed*; as if nothing had any reall existence but God. Plato in his dialogue Of Death calleth mans body τὸ σκῆνος, *a tabernacle*; so doth S. Paul 2. Cor. v. 1. Plato in the eighth of his Laws, Κοινωνία ψυχῆς καὶ σώματι διαλύσεως οὐκ ἔστιν ἢ κρεῖττον, ὡς ἐγὼ φαίην ἂν σπουδῇ λέγων, *The communion of the soul with the bodie is not better then the dissolution, as I would say if I were to speak*

in earneſt: Συνέχομαι γὰρ ἐκ τῶν δύο, ſaith S. Paul, Phil. i. 23. *For I am in a ſtrait betwixt two,* τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν ἔχων εἰς τὸ ἀναλῦσαι, καὶ σὺν Χριστῷ εἶναι· πολλῷ γὰρ μᾶλλον κρεῖσσον, *having a deſire to depart, and to be with Chriſt: which is farre better. To be with Chriſt,* farre better being, farre better ſaying. We heare no more of the Heathens when we ſpeak of Chriſt. As the Oracles are ſaid to have ceaſed at Chriſts nativity, ſo the Heathens are ſilent concerning Chriſt. Yet there is a ſort of writers behind which go thus farre, namely the Sibylls and Trismegiſt, and if there be any more ſuch. Nothing ſpoken of Chriſt with more dilucidation then by the Sibylls. By one of them, Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς, Θεοῦ Υἱὸς, Σωτὴρ, *Jeſus Chriſt, the Sonne of God, the Saviour;* the initiall and beginning letters of which propheſie being put in order together, make up the word ΙΧΘΥΣ, which ſignifieth *a Fiſh:* whence Tertullian calleth our Saviour *Piſcem.* And one of theſe Sibylls Virgil in one of his Eclogues is ſuppoſed, with good probability, to have imitated, namely in the fourth eclogue,

Te Duce, ſi qua manent ſceleris veſtigia noſtri,
Irrita perpetua ſolvent formidine terras;

meaning by *Te Duce* Chriſt, according to the Sibyll: And Chriſt is called Heb. ii. 10. ἀρχηγὸς τῆς σωτηρίας, *the Captain of our ſalvation.* Many other paſſages alſo there are in the ſame eclogue to the ſame purpoſe. And as for Trismegiſt, who is quoted ſo much by great Authours onely for rationall knowledge, as if he had no other light to direct him in his writings beſides the light of nature; in the ſecond page of his Pœmander he ſpeaketh of the Trinity as if he had been in heaven: & therefore for his opinion of the Trinity he was called Τρισμέγιστος, *Thrice-great,* or *Greateſt,* as Suidas ſaith. In that ſecond page of the Treatiſe we have

have his authority againſt the Arian hereſie: And the very term which Arius would not ſubſcribe unto we have there, namely ὁμοούσιον; he ſaith that he is CONSSENTIALL *with the Father*. And concerning the creation he ſpeaketh as if he had read Geneſis; Εὐθὺς οὖν ὁ Θεὸς αὐξάνεσθε καὶ πληθύνεσθε καὶ πλήθυνε: as if he ſhould ſay, that *God preſently after the creation ſpoke to man, Encreaſe and multiply, and repleniſh the earth*, as it is Gen. i. Our Saviour ſaith *there is none good but God:* Triſmegiſt; Ὁ δὲ Θεὸς τὸ ἀγαθὸν, ὅ ἐστι μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ φύσει, *God is the onely Good:* and how? as if he commented on Scripture before it was written, *not good onely as by an honorary term, but the Good by eſſence.* And in the thirteenth chapter of his Pœmander, Γενεσιουργὸς τῆς πολυσωμίας, ὅ, τι Θεοῦ παῖς, ἄνθρωπος κατὰ βούλημα Θεοῦ, *The Authour of regeneration is the Sonne of God, a man by the will of God.* But it is objected or may be, that theſe paſſages out of Triſmegiſt and the Sibylls are not to our purpoſe, ſeeing (as the opinion is of ſome) theſe Treatiſes were made by Eccleſiaſtick writers, and then aſcribed unto Gentiles, to make by an holy kind of deceit, the doctrine of the Goſpel more paſſable amongſt the Heathen. For anſwer; Cicero may refute this tenet, who in his *De natura Deorum* maketh mention of the Sibylls, and produceth ſomewhat of theirs. And as for Triſmegiſt, he was an Egyptian Doctour, as Reuchlinus and Suidas, and lived before Pharaoh, as Suidas ſaith, ἦκμασε δὲ περὶ τὸν Φαραώ. That then there were ſuch Heathens, and they authours of theſe ſayings which we ſpoke of, is more then probable. But whether their divine ſpeeches proceeded merely out of the principles of nature, or whether they ſprang from ſome other light, either of Divine revelation or Diabolicall (as Auguſtine thinketh *De Civit. Dei, viii.* 13.

concerning Triſmegiſt) I know not how to determine; I leave it *in medio*. Concerning the other kind of Gentile writers which we named before, it may alſo be ſaid that ſome of them had read the five books of Moſes, as likely S. Paul had read ſome or many of them. But whether ſo or not; whether ſome of them had borrowed their expreſſions from Scripture, and whether again S. Paul borrowed ſome of his other expreſſions from ſome of them, without mentioning any way ſuch Authours (as he maketh uſe of Menanders ſentence, 1. Cor. xv. 33. without any notice from whence he had it,

φθείρουσιν ἤθη χρῆθ' ὁμιλίαι κακαί,

Evil words corrupt good manners) I referre to better judgements. Onely this I may ſay, that Zanchy indeed thinketh that Pythagoras and Triſmegiſt and Plato had read ſome part of Scripture, and peradventure had learned ſome notions from the Jews: but he nameth none elſe in that place: And one of the paſſages we mentioned out of Plato beareth a ſimilitude unto ſuch another in the Epiſtle of S. Paul to the Philippians: Now that could not be taken from S. Paul. And as for Triſmegiſt, he ſpeaketh more clearly concerning the myſtery of the Trinitie then any place of the Old Teſtament. But ſuppoſe we now that all theſe places quoted out of them were abſolutely theirs, and not deduced from any higher doctrine, and not revealed by a ſupernaturall way; and ſuppoſe we a great many more of ſuch divine paſſages in them: what then? Happily it is expected now that from this little ſurvey of their knowledge ſome concluſion ſhould ariſe towards the eternall ſtate and condition of thoſe Heathens; and a concluſion alſo very favourable and charitable: as if by the ſmall poſie we have gathered

and

and made up of the beſt flowers in Natures garden, we might collect that their knowledge and goodneſſe and virtues and education were means likely able to put them not onely into a ſaveable eſtate, but alſo into a hopefull condition. For this I anſwer, I am not engaged any way by the text to ſpeak at all, much leſſe definitively, touching the finall end of the Gentiles. But he that thinketh too well of them, underſtandeth not ſufficiently the priviledge of the Goſpel: And God who is beſt able to judge, accounted the times of Paganiſme before Chriſt, for all their knowledge, even *times of ignorance*; and accordingly he reſpected them, as our Apoſtle in the ſecond verſe unto our text, *And the times of this ignorance God winked at*; ὑπεριδὼν ὁ Θεὸς, in the originall: which we may expound of a neglect; as if God *looked over* or *beyond* thoſe times, and had reſpect onely unto the times of Chriſtianity. And they have left Chriſtians to do in the rights what they have ſaid. And if we ſhould take a note of what they have not ſaid, we ſhould rather pitie their blindneſſe then admire their knowledge. God Creatour they might know *per ſpecies Creaturarum* (as they ſpeak) either in way of Negation, or Cauſalitie, or Eminence: but God Redeemer is not ſo perceiveable by light of nature. For nature is not able to ſee the need of a Saviour, it being ignorant of the lapſe of mankind, of which there appeareth not a word, not a ſyllable, in a direct expreſſion, not in any of their maſſie volumes. And where find we any mention of Faith in a Chriſtian notion? Inſomuch that what we even now demurred of, from whence Triſmegiſts & the Sibylls ſpeaking of Chriſt ſhould flow, we may here reſolve negatively, That they ſpake not ſo of Chriſt

Chriſt by the virtue onely of rationall knowledge. For firſt they could not by the light of humane reaſon ſee the uſe of any Saviour. Secondly, they could not moreover foreſee a Saviour by light of nature, if we account them to have been Prophets. And if ſome of them were as Chriſtians amongſt Heathens, yet Heathens they are amongſt Chriſtians. We might uſe ſomewhat of their ſcience, they needed ſome of our Scripture. For in a particle of the Poets ſaying there lyeth a grand errour of idolatry. There is a Jupiter in the His, in the Τοῦ: through whom yet S. Paul diſcerneth the true God; better underſtood then ſpoken. So we may paſſe here from the Form of quoting to the Sentence quoted; *For we are alſo his generation.*

But becauſe of dependance with our former diſcourſe, we will conſider the words in way of expoſition, according to the order in the originall, Τοῦ γὰρ καὶ γένος ἐσμέν. In the little particle τοῦ, we ſaid, is couched a little God, one Jupiter: and yet Saint Paul interpreteth the Poet as ſpeaking of the true God. That the Poet ſeemed to ſpeak it of Jupiter, appeareth by his beginning,

Ἐκ Διὸς ἀρχώμεσθα——

Let us beginne from Jupiter, or *with Jupiter*: And that Saint Paul interpreteth him of the true God, appeareth by the context. For having in the twenty fourth verſe of this chapter deſcribed the onely true God by his effects of Creation and Sovereignty of governance, in the twenty fifth verſe by his All-ſufficiency in himſelf, in the two next verſes by the manner of creation of man and end of that creation, and in the former part of this verſe (whereof our text is a part) epitomizing all by three expreſſions wherein we are referred unto God,

In

In him we live, we move, we have our being, he ſuperaddeth to refute their falſe tenets againſt the one true God, by the teſtimony of their Aratus, although the intention of the Poet at the firſt ſight appeareth to be otherwiſe directed. So that what theſe Philoſophers ſaid to our Apoſtle preaching Jeſus and the reſurrection, *He ſeemeth to be a ſetter-forth of ſtrange Gods*, ξένων δαιμονίων, may very well be retorted on their Poet; He ſeemeth to be a ſetter-forth of a ſtrange God, telling us of one Jupiter. What ſhall we ſay then? The Heathen ſpeaketh of the Heathen God: the Apoſtle underſtandeth him of the true. What? doth our Apoſtle mingle ſeeds? Is there any fellowſhip betwixt God and Belial? Can the Ark and Dagon ſtand together? Shall that ſonne of Saturn, Jupiter, be as the Sonne of God, Chriſt, God-man? God forbid. But as our Saviour anſwered the Jews thoughts oftentimes, not the outward tenour and drift of their words (whereby he manifeſted his Divinity) ſo S. Paul by a Divine Spirit ſearcheth the Poets intimate or ultimate intendment, and giveth not the ſenſe according to the ſtrict importance of the terms. The reaſon and ground of this expoſition we are now briefly and ὡς ἐν τύπῳ to diſcourſe of.

The Scholiaſt upon the Poet ſaith it may be interpreted of the Aire; S. Paul otherwiſe. The ground and lawfulneſſe of S. Pauls expoſition dependeth upon the diſcuſſion of this queſtion, Whether the Gentiles did abſolutely and ultimately determine their adorations and worſhips in thoſe falſe, thoſe made Gods; or whether they did not through them aim at a true Deitie. Towards the determining of this Probleme I may premiſe a propoſition or two: firſt, That Jupiter & his brethren and his

kindred were not Deities. This propoſition is ſuppoſed, not to be proved. Secondly, That ſome of the more ignorant ſort of the Gentiles might take them to be Gods, not knowing their originall, and miſtaking their Prophets when they ſpake of them; as alſo becauſe their underſtandings were not fitted by contẽplation to extract out of the *ſpecies* of the creatures a conceit of the nature of a pure Divine eſſence. For neither is this ſo great a ſtupidity as that of the vulgar and baſer ſort of the Papiſts, who terminate their worſhip in the images themſelves, by Pariſienſis his own confeſſion, *cap.* 23. *De legibus, Sicut & multi ſimplices homines hodie ſunt qui inter imagines ſanctorũ & ipſos ſanctos in ſuis orationibus non diſtinguunt*, They have not the trick, when they pray before an image of a Saint, in every act of their worſhip to frame an elevation of their minds from the repreſentation unto the Saint. Very likely then it is that the worſt of the Gentiles might think thoſe falſe Gods very Gods; and alſo might (as the Papiſts before) place their worſhip in the images of their Gods, becauſe the devil now and then did ſpeak his oracles through them. But thirdly, Though the fillier of the Heathen might think them to be the onely Gods, yet the more learned and intelligent of them did not firmly believe their abſolute Divinities. Tertullian therefore in his Apologetick ſpeaketh plainly to the Heathen, and appealeth unto their conſciences, *Appellamus & provocamus à vobis ad conſcientiam veſtram: illa nos judicet, illa nos damnet, ſi poterit negare omnes illos Deos veſtros homines fuiſſe.* And this may appear out of their practice towards them; which was ſo groſſe that the ſame Father telleth them, *Neſcio plúsne de vobis dii veſtri quàm de Chriſtianis querantur*, I know not whether

whether your Gods have more reason to complain of you or of Christians. Witnesse their fowl uncleannesses in their temples even by their Priests, witnesse their personating their Gods by that *tetrum genus pantomimorum*, and their whipping of their Diana on the stage. And he telleth them also how coursely they used their domestick Gods; *Domesticos Deos domesticâ potestate tractatis, oppignerando, venditando, demutando aliquando in trullam de Minerva.* And Varro, he saith, brought into publick view no lesse then thirty Jupiters without heads. Diogenes (as the same Father) but rather Diagoras, being in an inne, and having nothing to seeth his supper with, took Hercules his image and made a fire with it, with this insultation, *Now, Hercules, to thy thirteenth labour: seeth me my pottage.* And S. Augustine, *De civit. Dei, ii.* 12. besides many other places, taxeth them that they forbad the Poets to speak any ill of any citizen of Rome under a great penaltie; but let them speak what they would of the Gods; as if they had *majorem curam Romæ unius quàm totius cœli.* I might also tell you what handling they had in Homer: Venus wounded, and comforted by a Goddesse, by telling her it was their fortune:

Πολλοὶ γὰρ δὴ τλῆμεν,

We suffer in heaven many things from men on earth. Mars was imprisoned 13. moneths, Juno wounded by Hercules, Pluto hurt with a dart. Surely blind Homer jeered them. Socrates in contempt of their Deities sware by an Oke and a Goat, as Tertullian again: And one God would suffice him; for which he died as an Heathen martyr. Excellent is that of Plato, Τῆς μὲν γὰρ σπουδαίας ἐπιστολῆς ΘΕΟΣ ἄρχει, ΘΕΟΙ δὲ τῆς ἥττον. Plato maketh a difference betwixt his serious epistles and not serious by this signe; His serious

ones he beginneth with one God, the other with Gods. And Tertullian saith, *Multi Dii habuerunt Cæsarem iratum:* and we do not use to be angry with our superiours, as Aristotle saith in his Rhetoricks. And that the better and learneder of the Heathens could not heartily believe that they were very Gods, may be collected out of the lives of the Gods, their conversation, such as did not become men, much lesse Gods. Nay, Tertullian speaking to them of the behaviour of their gods, asketh them, *Quot tamen potiores viros?* Although they were somewhat good, how many better men have ye left below? as Aristides, and Socrates. And Augustine saith merrily, *Neq; enim erant suo Pontifice meliores*, The Gods were no better then their Priests. And Cyrill of Hierusalem flouteth Jupiter, Εἰ μοιχὸς ἐστι, θεὸς μὴ καλείσθω, as before, *If Jupiter be an adulterer, for shame let him not be called a God.* What reverent esteem could those have of their God in the night, who worshipped the Sunne? and in the day, who worshipped the Moon? They were Ἄθεοι κατὰ νύκτα, Atheists in the night, which worshipped the Sunne; and Atheists in the day, which worshipped the Moon, as Cyrill wittily. But as the same Authour upon this subject breaketh out, Βορβορόμεθα ταῦτα λέγοντες, so I, We rake a dunghill in this discourse of dunghil-gods. We will therefore roll up this proposition in a better, which is the principall one for the exposition of the text; That the learneder sort of the Gentiles, some more clearly, some more indistinctly, according to the measure of common illumination from God, and light of their own reason, did ultimately aim at a true Divinity, even amongst their false ones.

Here might I inlarge my self by treating of the cognoscibility of God by humane understanding without any

any ſupernaturall doctrine, which Lombard handleth in the third Diſtinction of his firſt book, and which the Schoolmen diſpute of: and I might ſpeak of the wayes how we may come to the knowledge of God: and I might tell you that a rationall facultie without an infinite ſecond depravation, and ſome thicker miſt of Satan, doth not, nay cannot frame to it ſelf a conceit of an abſolute Deitie of ſuch a nature as is either inferiour to it ſelf or not tranſcendently above it: here alſo might I again enter upon that large theme, How farre the Heathens have gone in their expreſſions of God: But to confirm this concluſion, I will onely produce one or two teſtimonies out of the Fathers, and one out of ſacred Scripture, and ſo paſſe this naturall Divinity. Arnobius in his firſt book *adverſus Gentes* bringeth in the Gentiles endeavouring to clear themſelves of a ſuppoſed imputation and ſlander, that they acknowledged not the true God; and they ſpeak as if they were angry that Chriſtians ſhould think ſo of them; *Sed fruſtrà nos falſo & calumnioſo inceſsitis crimine, tanquam eamus inficias eſſe Deum majorem, cùm à nobis Jupiter nominetur, & Optimus habeatur & Maximus.* And the ſame Eccleſiaſtick writer telleth them that they mingled the true God with the falſe, *Diſsimilia copulare atque in unam ſpeciem cogere, inducti à confuſione conamini.* And to confirm this opinion of the Father we may make uſe of a place in Macrobius in the firſt book of his *Saturnalia*, where he undertaketh to reduce all the Heathen Gods unto the Sunne, which very likely was the firſt object of Idolatry. Now amongſt the attributes of the Sunne he findeth in Orpheus the name Jah put into a Greek termination, which otherwiſe is one of the names whereby God is expreſſed

in Scripture; Pſal. lxviii. 4. *Praiſe him in his name*, in the originall, ביה שמו *in his name* JAH. And *Halleluiah* in Scripture is no other then *Praiſe the Jah*, or *the Lord*. Whereby it is manifeſt that they ſhuffled in the true God amongſt the falſe ones. For certainly a full ignorance of a more ſuperlative Deitie then the other falſe Gods were of, is ſcarce conceiveable amongſt the wiſer of the Gentiles. Arnobius therefore in the beginning of his ſecond book bringeth in the Heathens again ſpeaking for themſelves, or rather in behalf of their Gods, *Sed non idcirco Dii vobis infeſti ſunt*, &c. *Our Gods are not therefore your enemies, O ye Chriſtians, becauſe ye worſhip an omnipotent God, but becauſe ye maintein a man, born, and alſo crucified (which onely is for baſe perſons) to be a God, and believe him yet to be alive, and do alſo worſhip him in your dayly invocations.* If we would analyſe this place, we might make out of it a full demonſtration to our purpoſe. Here is a confeſſion of an omnipotent God: Here is an implicit aſſertion that this God is to be worſhipped: Here is a denying of Divine worſhip to man; therefore (they ſay) Chriſt is not to be worſhipped, becauſe man. Could they then determine their adorations upon their Gods, whom ſome of them knew to be men? nay, ſome of the Heathen were ancienter then their Gods. Varro therefore propounded to himſelf this method in writing; Firſt to write of things humane, then of things divine: A ſtrange order one would think; but his reaſon is good and witty, *Quia civitates Diis quos ipſa inſtituerant, ut pictor tabellâ, priores ſunt*, Becauſe as the painter is before the picture, ſo the cities are before the Gods whom the cities created. Amongſt the ſorts of Gods alſo which they made, namely three, Poeticall, Civil, Philoſophicall; the

the Philoſophicall Gods (which one would imagine to be the beſt) were not accounted by the Philoſophers to be true Gods: onely the common people might not know ſo much, as an Authour hath it. But come we now to an authority out of Scripture for the eſtabliſhment of our point. No place ſo pregnant as where Saint Paul diſcuſſeth the knowledge of the Gentiles, in the firſt chapter to the Romanes, from the eighteenth to the twenty fourth verſe. Eſpecially to our purpoſe he ſpeaketh in the twenty firſt and twenty ſecond verſes. In the twenty firſt verſe, *Becauſe that when they knew God*; *They*, the Gentiles: they knew God two wayes: by the book of the Creature in the twentith verſe; by naturall light, in the nineteenth verſe, *That which may be known of God is manifeſt in them.* Or if you pleaſe, naturall knowledge was able to collect a Divinitie out of the book of the Creature: So God manifeſted what may be known of him to them, as in the nineteenth; God expreſſed himſelf to them in the vaſt & ample volume of the world. To return unto our twenty firſt verſe; *Becauſe that when they knew God, they glorified him not as God.* Glorifie him then they did, but not in the right manner, not in the right ὡς: οὐχ ὡς; Οὐδὲν ἐδόξασαν, not immediately, not diſtinctly, not onely, not ſo well as they knew him, *but*, as in the three and twentieth verſe, *they changed the glory*: that is, relatively, and *quoad nos* (for abſolutely and in it ſelf Gods glory cannot ſuffer any alteration) *they changed the glory of the incorruptible God,* ἐν ὁμοιώματι *into the ſimilitude*, or *by the ſimilitude, of the image of corruptible man*; that is, as Calvine expoundeth it, They made man to repreſent God: Whence it is evident then, that they did worſhip ultimately the true God through thoſe true men, falſe Gods.

Gods. As for the adoring of the Images of their Gods, that the learneder of them diſclaimed, as the Reverend Primate of Ireland quoteth them ſpeaking in the ſixth of Arnobius, *Deos per ſimulacra veneramur*; and through or by thoſe falſe Gods they aimed at the true. The knowledge of a God was ſo evident, τὸ γνωστὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ φανερὸν, and it was ſo firmly grounded, it was ἐν αὐτοῖς, *in them*, in reſpect of the principles they had of God, and in reſpect of an abilitie of underſtanding to inferre a Divinity out of the creation, that unleſſe they would deny what they ſaw, they could not diſacknowledge a God: and if ſo, then it would follow to them that he is to be worſhipped. That there is a God, is principled in nature: and from hence reſulteth naturally by a moſt ſtrict and neceſſary connexion, That this God is to be ſerved & honoured & worſhipped. For the apprehenſion of a Divine nature cannot but conceive in it a right unto this homage by a double relation of it unto the creature, of ſovereigne Power, and of Goodneſſe. The former requireth a reverent fear, the other an affectionate love, which will exerciſe themſelves in outward worſhip. And let us now ſuppoſe this for a *principium ſecundo-primum* (as they term it) namely, That God is to be worſhipped: from hence alſo by conſequent will enſue, That an Idole is not to be worſhipped; for an Idole is not God. That rationall light that ſeeth a God, is able to ſee one God onely: that light that ſeeth one God onely, muſt reject an Idole. Now ſince in a Divine eſſence there is conſidered ſo much majeſty and glory that they might think it an impudent preſumption to make an immediate addreſſe unto this great God, therefore they might think they ſhould do God ſervice in ſhewing their honour of him by the doing honour

nour unto his glorious creatures, the Sunne, the Moon, and the like, and in making great men after death as mediatours betwixt him and them (as the Papists upon the like plea make Angels and Saints their intercessours) which in processe of time by mens ignorance and the devils deceit came to be esteemed of the common sort as complete Gods: not so of the more intelligent of them, as we have shewed; these did not terminate their adorations in the Heathen Gods, but looked further at God the Ancient of dayes, whom Thales one of the Seven of Greece called πρεσβύτατον τῶν ὄντων, *the most ancient of all things*, as Laertius saith of him in his Life. So that the difference of the worship of these from the worship of true Christians, is this; True Christians worship God through Christ God-man; they worshipped God by men supposed Gods. So Aratus through *Jupiter* meaneth GOD: So Saint Paul understandeth him. Nevertheless this worshipping of God by mediation and image, whether of man or beast, God accounteth a false worship: So he esteemed the Israelites worshipping him by a calf. Man doth indeed, but God doth not make such a distinction; therefore God saith, Exod. xxxii. 8. to Moses concerning the people of Israel, *They have made them a molten calf, and have worshipped it:* It; God would not own that worship and service exhibited under the representation of that calf. Deut. iv. 15. God biddeth the people of Israel take notice that when he spake unto them out of the midst of the fire they saw no similitude of him, *Take ye therefore good heed unto your selves: for ye saw no manner of similitude on the day that the Lord spake unto you in Horeb out of the midst of the fire. No manner of similitude*; as if he should have told them that he on pur-

poſe did not appear unto them under any viſible form or ſimilitude, leſt they ſhould repreſent him by that form, and under it worſhip him; which he ſo much warneth them of in that place. For that of Varro upon this point is very true; the worſhipping of the Gods by images increaſed the errour, took away the fear of the Gods: *Qui primi Deorum ſimulacra induxerunt, errorem auxerunt, metum demſerunt*, as Calvine citeth his words. Thus we have in ſome ſort given you the reaſon and ground of our Apoſtles interpretation of the Poet.

Now by this, though haſty and ſhort diſcourſe of the Gentile worſhip occaſioned by S. Pauls expreſſion, we may in ſome manner calculate and decipher the difference betwixt the falſe worſhip of Rome Pagane and Rome Chriſtian, of Gentiles and of Papiſts, which difference in a Pontifician eye is ſo wide and mighty. All the diſtinction muſt either be in the object worſhipped, or the manner of worſhipping. Chriſtian Rome worſhippeth God: So did Rome Pagane, as we have heard. Chriſtian Rome by Images; ſo Rome Pagane. Pagane Rome worſhipped by men, though not onely by men: Chriſtian Rome by the form of an old man worſhip God the Father. And Chriſtian Rome worſhippeth God by men-ſaints (beſides by Angels) and ſome of thoſe Saints happily as bad for Chriſtians as the other were for Heathens; nay ſuch ſome of them were who had onely Chriſtian names but Heathen lives. The ſillier of the Heathen might worſhip the men for true Gods: the beſt of Rome Chriſtian give a kind of Divine worſhip to Saints. The ſillier of the Heathen might worſhip the Images of their feigned Gods: the ſilliest of the Papiſts diſtinguiſh not betwixt the Image of the Saint and the

Saint,

Saint, as Parisiensis confesseth. But the Heathens worshipped by other creatures: but Aquinas giveth λατρεία, the proper Divine worship, to the Wood, to the Crosse, and to the Bread. But the Heathen worshipped by a multitude of Gods: but the Papists by more Saints and Angels. The Heathen had for every occasion a severall Tutelar Mediatour: the Papists likewise have a severall Saint, beside their particular Angel. But Tertullian saith, *Multi Dii habuerunt Cæsarem iratum:* what is this to our purpose? and yet we can answer them; *Multi Cæsares habuerunt Papam iratum*, and more then angry too; they have felt his anger and his furie, and his state, and his cruelty. But the Romane Senate (as Eusebius saith) made Gods of men; just as the Pontifician Senate maketh Gods of Saints. But the Papists sinne not yet in worshipping by Images. For sinne being a transgression of the Law, and *where no law is there is no transgression*, Rom. iv. 15. they have taken an order to take away the law by which they are forbidden to worship by Images, namely the second Commandment; for they leave out this in their Catechisme. Is this thy pietie, O Rome Christian? Is this the difference of thy Religion from Paganisme? Plutarch saith it is sacriledge to worship by Images, who was an Heathen; and thou blottest out the Law of God whereby it is forbidden, that thou mayest do it more freely. Thus to thy doing what God and Nature hath forbidden, thou addest a transcendent offense in proscribing in a manner what God hath written with his own hand. This unfaithfull and sacrilegious dealing with sacred Scripture hinteth me to the next particle in our text, ΓΑΡ, which is a testimony of a faithfull quotation, τῶ γὰρ——

The Philoſopher told his friends, when they came into his little and mean cottage, for their comfort, ἐνταῦθα ἐνδαίμονες θεοί, *The Gods are even here with me:* So there is Divinity and a ſacred uſe even in this little ſlender particle γάρ. *Deus magnus in minimis:* and there is much importance in this little word. It may be taken (as other words) either formally or materially: formally, and ſo it is ſignificative; materially, ſo not. It may be taken in this place ſignificatively in reference unto the former words of the verſe, *In him we live, we move, and have our being.* In him we live, and move, and have our being: For; becauſe *we are his offspring.* This ſenſe is good, as Huſhai ſaid to Abſalom of Achitophels counſel; it is good, but not at this time. Severall ſenſes in Scripture may be true in the *theſis*, but not proper in the *hypotheſis*, in the particular χόσις and connexion of the words; ſo neither this: Becauſe 1. the former words, *In him we live and move and have our being*, do render the cauſe of the precedent verſes, as γὰρ ſignifieth there, & therefore have more immediate and neceſſary reſpect unto them. 2. Becauſe our Apoſtle here intendeth to produce onely the authority of ſome Heathen to be ſymbolicall to what he had ſaid before, out of which teſtimony he would deduce his inference againſt Idolatry, as he doth make uſe of this ſaying to that purpoſe in the next verſe unto my text. 3. Becauſe it is very likely that the particle ΓΑΡ is to be taken in the ſame manner as καὶ in the text: Now we cannot well conceive any uſe of the ſignificativeneſſe of καὶ, therefore alſo γὰρ, ſemblably, is not ſignificative. It is ſignificative and connexive in the Poet, not in the Apoſtle. To what end ſerveth it then, it may be demanded. Are there any redundances in Scripture? Is S. Paul

Paul to pleaſe the Philoſophers become Homericall in his expletives? There is a painted heaven, and a printed heaven, an heaven painted with ſtarres, an heaven printed, the ſacred Scripture: And as God a moſt intellectuall Agent (intellectuall above our underſtanding) wrought neither magnitude nor multitude without ſome end and reaſon; ſo neither ſuch a number of ſtarres in the heaven above was made without good purpoſe, ſo neither ſuch a number of words in the heaven below. The Jews(as it is ſaid of them)numbred the verſes,the words, the letters in the Old Teſtament: and is it not written in the New, *Not an Iõta ſhall periſh*, as not an *Iõta* put in? (If ſo, Arius might have urged the place) *Whatſoever is written is written for our inſtruction.* The very unſignificativeneſſe of the particle is ſignificative: for it is *teſtimonium fidelis citationis*, as Sanctius a good Expoſitour obſerveth upon the place. Our Apoſtle, happily, thought it to have the weight of a morall argument towards the perſwading of the Heathens unto the truth of religion,to exhibite to them a ſigne of the truth of his quotation. He is ſo farre from concealing any thing which ſhould make againſt him, that he taketh in the ſmall words alſo of the hemiſtich, although they be of no uſe in the ſentence. We have hence firſt an occaſion of an obſervation; ſecondly, we have hence the uſe of a divine example.

Firſt,we have an occaſion of an obſervation, That our Apoſtle differeth in the quoting of the Heathens from his quoting of Scripture,the Old Teſtament. The Heathens he quoteth punctually without any alteration, *adverbum*, κατὰ πόδα: He quoteth places of Scripture not ſo; but ſometimes with amplification, ſometimes with omiſſion, ſometimes with alteration: And ſo do the other Penmen

of the New Teſtament. Now the reaſon why S. Paul and the reſt did not cite ſtrictly the words and terms of the Old, but rendred the ſenſe of the places with ſome variation, was, becauſe they being appointed to be Teachers of the Goſpel, were inſpired with infallible knowledge, and enabled with full authority, not onely to quote and produce but alſo to expound, and not onely to expound but alſo to apply the Teſtimonies of the Old Inſtrument or Covenant for the manifeſtation and uſe of the New, according to their purpoſe, as is obſerved. 1. Cor. ii. 9. our Apoſtle quoteth a place in Iſaiah, *But as it is written, Eye hath not ſeen, nor eare heard, neither hath it entred into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him.* The place is written Iſaiah lxiv. 4. *For ſince the beginning of the world men have not heard nor perceived by the eare, neither hath the eye ſeen, O God, beſides thee, what he hath prepared for him that waiteth for him.* S. Paul in this one place omitteth ſomewhat which was written in the Prophet, and varieth ſomewhat; and addeth, *neither hath it entred into the heart of man:* and this addition is for greater amplification and emphaſis of the matter. Iſaiah lii. 7. *How beautifull upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings?* S. Paul Rom. x. 15. maketh uſe of this Scripture, *As it is written, How beautifull are the feet of them that preach the Goſpel of peace?* He leaveth out, *upon the mountains*, which Iſaiah hath; and alſo the Prophet Nahum ſpeaking of the ſame thing, chap. i. verſ. 15. And S. Paul leaveth out that, becauſe the Prophets (as is obſerved) were to preach onely unto the Jews, in a mountainous countrey; the Apoſtles were to go to preach the Goſpel to all the world. Likewiſe S. Paul differeth from the text in alteration: as Eph. iv. 8. *Wherefore he ſaith, When*

he

he aſcended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts to men: This is ſaid Pſal. lxviii. 18. *Thou art gone up on high, thou haſt led captivity captive, and received gifts for men.* The Pſalmiſt ſaith, *Thou haſt received*; S. Paul ſaith, *He gave.* Now that he gave gifts to men explaineth the end of his receiving gifts: He received that he might give. With which if we compare that of S. John, in the firſt of his Goſpel at the ſixteenth verſe, *Of his fulneſſe we have all received, and grace for grace*, we may make an other manner of expoſition of it then thoſe who interpret χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος, *grace upon grace*, againſt the propriety of the Greek; or then thoſe who can here find any Merit on our part, as if God gave us more grace for the merit of what we have; or then he who expoundeth by the former *grace* the Old Teſtament, by the latter the New, as if Chriſts fulneſſe of grace ſhould not rather inferre our receiving of grace from him by the merit of his grace, then that we ſhould receive the New Teſtament for the Old, ſince under ALL WE *have received* are included alſo thoſe faithfull that lived before Chriſt, who indeed had received grace, though not the Goſpel, *rem Evangelii*, though not *Evangelium*, not in exhibition actuall; they had received it in a promiſe, and in types, and by prophecie. Thus our Apoſtle in his quotations of Scripture addeth for illuſtration and amplification, omitteth for pertinence, altereth for explanation: but he doth not in the Poet here; he reciteth the very words in their order; he taketh the teſtimony whole, that the Philoſophers ſhould have nothing to except againſt the quotation.

Secondly therefore, we have from hence a divine rule and example, or a rule divine by example, concerning an honeſt and faithfull and ingenuous citing of authours.

thours. S. Paul produceth the very words, the very particles, which yet were of no moment towards his drift of inference. Whereby I believe our Apoſtle read the authour himſelf. And to this end, that I may cite an authour truly and certainly, let me reade the authour and the originall; let me reade them my ſelf. The quotations of others which they make of authours may be falſe, and therefore will deceive. The connexion, the interpunction, the accent, the ſenſe of the term in the writers time, may turn the ſenſe of the place; and ſo what I reade of an authour at the ſecond hand may ſeem to be the authours, but peradventure it is the quoters: therefore let me reade the authour, or at leaſt quote the quoter. Let me reade the originall: Tranſlations may vary. They may be either falſe or ſlender, inexpreſſive, obſcure, obſcurer ſometimes then the Text. As one anſwered, being asked whether he ſhould reade ſuch a comment upon Ariſtotle, anſwered, *Yes*, ſaid he, *when Ariſtotle is underſtood then reade the comment*: So interpretations may be as perplexed as the text.

And by S. Pauls particular uſage of an authour here in the text, I might take a riſe unto a generall treating, in way of reprehenſion, of the Abuſe of authours, contrary to our Apoſtles practice: And then I might note who, and how, and wherein, and who moſt, and how farre they have proceeded in this moſt disingenuous injury unto writers deceaſed or living. But this would be a theme for ſome grave Ariſtarchus and learned Critick, not for a man of yeſterday. Beſides, I might be afraid of that of Solomon, *He that reproveth the wicked getteth to himſelf a blot*. Surely Solomon was herein a Prophets ſonne in an extraordinary ſenſe, in the Scripture-phraſe, that is, a young

young Prophet; as if he had propheſied of a generation which make it as true as they are falſe, who, if one hath but chanced to raſe in his writing the utmoſt skin, and to wipe but as it were the *ſuperficies* of their doctrine or manners, though never ſo deſervedly, have given him a blot in their *Indices Expurgatorii*, *DELEATUR*, *DELEATUR*. The Pontifician falſifications Chamier reduceth unto two heads; a παρερμηνία, and a παγγραφή, a *falſe Interpretation* of Authours, and a *falſe Printing*: The former they are not a little guilty in; as Bellarmine, and Grodecius, and others: but it falling not ſo directly under our cenſure from the example of our Apoſtle, I will omit it. Their falſification in παγγραφή, *falſe Printing*, is in three reſpects or wayes; by Addition, by Detraction or Taking-away, by Alteration. 1. by addition they abuſe authours, commanding in their *Indices*, that whereas any Authour ſpeaketh againſt them, in the next edition of thoſe authours they ſhould be branded with this marginall addition, *Autor eſt damnatus*; and ſometimes, *Autor eſt damnatus, ſed jam permiſſus poſt expurgationem*; and ſometimes, *Hic cautè legatur*. 2. they abuſe by detraction. No leſſe then 800. writers are purged in one of their *Indices*, that of Spain, by the Archbiſhop of Toledo the generall Inquiſitour. *Deleatur* here ſuch a paſſage, here ſuch a ſentence; in this authour this, in that authour that; here an whole Epiſtle of Hulderick; there an Epiſtle in the firſt Tome of Athanaſius, as ye may ſee in the 37 page of the forenamed *Index*. Here ſuch a ſentence of ſuch a Father is to be left out in the next edition, as appeareth in the front of that Index. All kinds of authours are purged thus by them; ours, theirs; ſacred, prophane; all Humanity without any humanitie. Thirdly, they abuſe

by variation, by alteration: ſo in Vatablus his *ſcholia* upon the xvii. Pſalme, the 7. verſe they command in the next Editions to be read for *Imagines*, *Idola*. The marginall note there is, *confuſio iis qui adorant imagines*: they ſay, *Reade it* IDOLA, in the lxxx. page of the *Index*. Beſides they abuſe authours in the *Indices* of the authours, commanding the references unto any place where they are touched any whit boldly, or in their grand articles and points, to be put out. But they will ſay, no Authour hath been actually falſified thus. Nevertheleſſe they have ſhewed their good will, or rather their ill will, their malice, their villany, in commanding that they ſhould be corrupted: and God hath ſhewed his providence and approbation of the truth of the Proteſtant religion, in that he prevented the effect by diſcoverie of the *Indices*, whereby Proteſtant Divines were warned and admoniſhed to keep faſt their old editions, of the Fathers eſpecially, which otherwiſe (as near as they could) they would have called in. And yet God hath in his wiſdome permitted ſome to be indeed falſified, that we might have inſtances *de facto* for the confirmation of our belief that they had ſuch treacherous minds unto the truth, and that they repented not of that tranſcendent deſigne, to ſilence all the world that had or ſhould ſpeak againſt them. For beſides the *Indices expurgatorii*, whereof we have ſome with us, which are ſufficient witneſſes of their intention, Ferus, one of their own, yet in many points of our religion ours, (as appeareth by their dealing towards him) in his comment upon the firſt epiſtle of S. John, in fifty leaves is falſified thrice fifty times, as is exactly obſerved. In thrice fifty places doth the Romane Edition of him, which came out 1577. differ in the former wayes, either

either adding or taking away or altering from the Antwerp-edition, which came out 1556. And not onely Ferus, but Fulbert alſo Biſhop of Chartres, who lived in the eleventh centurie, is falſified by addition. He ſpeaking upon the Euchariſt hath theſe words, NISI MANDUCAVERITIS, *inquit*, CARNEM FILII HOMINIS, ET SANGUINEM BIBERITIS, NON HABEBITIS VITAM IN VOBIS. *Facinus vel flagitium videtur jubere: figura ergò eſt præcipiens paſſioni Domini eſſe communicandum tantùm, & ſuaviter atque utiliter recondendum in memoria quòd pro nobis caro ejus crucifixa & vulnerata eſt.* in the 168. leaf: Now in the yeare 1608. there was ſet out an Edition of him in Paris, where we have interſerted after *Figura ergo eſt*, DICET HÆRETICUS, thus; *Unleſſe* (ſaith Chriſt) *ye eat the fleſh of the Sonne of man, and drink his bloud, ye ſhall not have life in you. He ſeemeth to command an impietie and great wickedneſſe: it is therefore a figure*, WILL THE HERETIQUE SAY. Theſe words *will the heretique ſay*, are put in by him that ſet out Fulbert, to make what Fulbert ſpoke *aſſertivè* from Auguſtine, to ſpeak *recitativè* of the heretique, as if the Heretique ſhould ſay, *This is a figure*, &c. For if Chriſts words be to be underſtood in a figure, by a trope, as Fulbert from Auguſtine, then the bread and the wine in the Euchariſt are not tranſubſtantiated. This teſtimony therefore being peremptory againſt them, they thought to take an order with, and to make to ſpeak for them. The Pope maketh Biſhop Fulbert recant five hundred and more years after his death. But by the bargain in their own opinion we have S. Auguſtine an heretique, and therefore he is ours, whom yet by all means they would have to be a very abſolute Papiſt: For the words

which Fulbert produceth there for the expounding of our Saviour (although he approveth them in the reciting) are indeed no other mans then Saint Auguſtines in his ſecond book *De doctrina Chriſtiana*, the ſixteenth chapter. And the publiſher of Fulbert being told hereof, that the words were Auguſtines which he had branded with hereſie, he put afterwards his DICET HÆRETICUS amongſt his *Errata*, as ye may reade in the learned Primate of Irelands Anſwer unto the Jeſuites Challenge, in the fifteenth page. O ſea Apoſtolicall, how farre art thou from imitation of our Apoſtle S. Paul here, who dealeth truly with his Authour, and reciteth ſtrictly the words! O thou ſacred virgin Truth, how art thou defloured by thoſe who account it a ſinne for them to marry! Shall not now Adulteration of authours be one ſigne of the Whore? Shall not falſification of writers be a ſigne of the falſe Prophet? Is this the way to prove the truth of their Religion, and of their Church? It ſeemeth where Peters keyes cannot open the difficulty, his ſword muſt cut the knot. This abuſe of authours is one of the ſcandals they give the Jews, who live amongſt them, which is ſo offenſive to them amongſt other things that they are never like to be converted to Chriſtianity in Rome, as Sandys obſerveth. Tell me if ever the Chriſtian world conceived ſuch a monſter of injury and inhumanity (to ſay no worſe) which reached not onely to the living but to the dead, to the dead Saints, and made thoſe reverend Authours and Profeſſours of divine truth ſpeak ſo flatly againſt their conſciences in their graves. We cannot leave theſe men better then abruptly, in an indignation: And ſo we may paſſe from a kind of Satans brood unto Gods *offspring*; *For we are alſo his offspring*.

Having

Having now expounded the HIS in the text to be Gods, and the particles FOR and ALSO to be onely teſtimonies of an ingenuous quotation, and ſo not eſſentiall to the ſenſe of the propoſition, the ſtrict and clear ſubſtance of the words will be this, *We are Gods offspring.* The queſtion now is concerning the ſuppoſition of the ſubject of the propoſition, WE, how much it importeth.

If we conſider the words without any reference unto Saint Pauls conſequence out of them in the next verſe, this WE may ſignifie in a double acception, *reduplicativè, ſpecificativé.* Firſt reduplicatively, moſt univerſally, comprehending all Entities, all creatures, whether of Being onely, or Life beſides Being, or Senſe beſides both, or Reaſon beſides all, or pure Reaſon without Senſe, as Angels; all of him and from him, from the higheſt Angel in heaven to the loweſt in hell. Bad ones, as of men, ſo of Angels: as *ones*, his, Gods; as *bad*, their own. It is a rationall creatures weakneſſe to be able to ſinne: It is Gods omnipotence to create, from the king to the begger, from Dan to Beerſheba, from the greateſt mountain to the ſlendereſt atome, all of all; all proceed from him who proceedeth from none. But this *all* is too much for S. Pauls drift, and for the common expreſſion WE. This ſenſe is fit for the propoſition, but too wide and redundant for the inference. Secondly then WE *ſpecificativè*, or indeed ſpecially, *We men.* So the Apoſtle meaneth it in the next verſe, *Since then we are the offspring of God, we are not to think that the Godhead is like to gold or ſilver or ſtone graven by art or mans deviſe*; as if man ſhould be the image by which God ſhould be worſhipped, if he would be worſhipped by any. In man is the image of God though defaced by that originall ſinne.

And no better Embleme for repreſenting the God of the whole or of all, as Ignatius in his Epiſtles, and Theodoret in his Queſtions calleth him, then Man, who is the Epitome of the whole, of all, the Docquet of the book of the creature, ὅλος ἐν κόσμῳ κόσμος, *a whole world in a world*, a little one in a great one, ſo that Democritus in his opinion of more worlds was out but in quantity, for there be many little worlds.

And we are Gods *offspring* in a threefold reſpect; in reſpect of our bodies, in reſpect of our ſouls, in reſpect of both together. Theſe ſeverall conſiderations for our more diſtinct proceeding may ſerve, if you pleaſe, in lieu of a diviſion.

Firſt of the firſt; we are Gods offspring in reſpect of our body. Now God is the Authour of our bodies (to ſpeak in an univerſalitie) two wayes; immediately, or mediately: immediately, of our firſt Parents, though in ſome difference of manner; mediately, of the reſt. The immediate production is alſo twofold; *Ex parte Materiæ, ex parte Efficientis*. Immediate production in reſpect of matter maketh a ſimple creation, when ſomewhat is made out of no præexiſtent ſubject at all: So Adam was not made in reſpect of his body, it being formed of the duſt of the earth, Gen. ii. 7. *And God formed man of the duſt of the ground*. The ſecond immediate production is in reſpect of efficient: So Adam was created immediately by God, no other Agent coming betwixt and helping the Divine omnipotence in raiſing ſo glorious a fabrick out of ſo unlikely a ſubject. And therefore this is alſo called a Creation *ſecundùm quid*; no created virtue being able out of ſuch an indiſpoſed matter to make ſuch a work. And as Adam was thus immediately produced by

by God in respect of his body, so was his wife Eve: They had a different matter, but the same efficient of their being: God made the woman off the rib of man. Indeed Constantinus Manasses saith that Adam was to Eve πλευροπάτωρ.

Ἀδὰμ δ' ὁ χωμοτόπλαστος, ὁ πρῶτος ἐν ἀνθρώποις,
Ἕυας τῆς παντομήτρας γίγονε πλευροπάτωρ.

But the Authour spake here as a Poet, as the Fathers sometimes like Rhetoricians. Adam concurred not in any way of Agency towards the production of his Wife: he was not maried to his daughter. God took the rib from him when he was in a deep sleep, and off it framed the body of Eve. Matter in the beginning of time was taken from man to make a woman: and matter in the fulnesse of time was taken from a woman to make a man, even the man Christ Jesus. So God was the Authour without any other of the bodies of Adam and Eve. God by this immediate production had a sonne and a daughter, as we may speak. And this sonne and daughter immediate causes of our ordinary generation are the causes why to us God is not the immediate. God almighty who shewed what he could do in that extraordinary production of our first parents, is now pleased to bring men into the world in way of a successive traduction by them. Parents we have: and God will have us account them so; for he giveth us a law to honour them, by reverence, by obedience, by gratitude, as it is expounded: Yet not so are they the authours of our being according to the flesh, not so *fathers of our flesh*, (as they are called, Hebr. xii. 9.) as if God were excluded from being our Father also according to a common manner of expression. God by a proper generation, a generation naturall, hath but one

one Sonne, the ſecond perſon in the Trinitie: yet God in Scripture is commonly called a Father without any reference unto the ſecond Perſon. God ſaith, Mal. 1. *If I be a Father, where is my honour?* And he is a Father as Creatour, expreſſely, Mal. ii. 10. *Have we not all one Father? hath not one God created us?* What more uſuall in the Greek then to expreſſe *Authour* by πατὴρ? there is ſcarce any other word for it. So Martiall for the Latine calleth his books his *children*. So God is ſaid to be *the Father of Spirits*, Heb. xii. ſo the devil *the father of a lie*, in S. John. And thus we have expounded how God is ſaid to be *our Father*, and how in the text we are called *Gods offspring*; not in ſtrict proper ſpeech, but according to the common uſe of expreſſing the producer of any thing by the *Father* or *Parent* of it. So Tertullian to our purpoſe in his book *De Anima*, *Omne quod quoquo modo accipit eſſe, generatur*. But more directly in the following words, *Nam & factor ipſe parens facti dici poteſt, ſic & Plato utitur*. Now that God is the Authour of our bodies by our Parents, that he hath a finger, nay a hand, nay hands in framing our bodies, we have the expreſſe teſtimony of the Prophet David, Pſal. cxix. *Thy hands have made me and faſhioned me.* And again, Pſal. cxxxix. 12. *For my reins are thine: thou haſt covered me in my mothers wombe. I will give thanks unto thee, for I am fearfully and wonderfully made,* נוֹרָאוֹת נִפְלֵיתִי מַעֲשֶׂיךָ, *mirificatus ſum mirabilibus operibus tuis*, as Montanus rendreth it; *I am fearfully and wonderfully made.* I am moulded, I am made as it were and compoſed altogether in wonders, beyond all underſtanding and expreſſion, ſo ſtrangely, ſo ſubtilly, ſo beyond the power of man. The words import more then we can ſay. The Prophet may well go on; *Marvellous*

vellous are thy works, and that my ſoul knoweth right well. It knoweth onely that they are marvellous, and ſo above knowledge. *My bones are not hid from thee, though I be made ſecretly, and faſhioned beneath in the earth. Thine eyes did ſee my ſubſtance yet being imperfect, and in thy book were all my members written; which day by day were faſhioned, while as yet there were none of them.* To this place happily S. Auguſtine alludeth in his Confeſſions, ſpeaking of his parents Patricius and Monica, *per quorum carnem introduxiſti me in hanc vitam; quemadmodum, neſcio,* how, I know not. The wombe is Gods doore, which he openeth to give men induction into the world. Think we that a little petty matter of ſeed by the created virtue of a created faculty, πλαστικὴ or γονιμικὴ δυνάμις, as they call it, could or ſhould without a ſupernaturall direction and ſupereſficiencie elaborate, and frame, and ſquare, and poliſh in the obſcure wombe, in no long time, ſuch a ſtructure of fleſh, ſo faſhionable, ſo ſerviceable, ſo ſtrong and trimme, ſo ordered and connexed, that an Heathen hereupon called God, Ἀειστοτέχνην, *the beſt Artiſt*; and another called mans body καλὸν ποίκιλμα τέκτονος σοφοῦ, *a fair variegated piece of a wiſe builder?* Job excellently in this matter, chap. x. 8. where ſpeaking to God, he ſaith, *Thy hands have made me and faſhioned me together round about, yet thou doſt deſtroy me. Remember I beſeech thee, that thou haſt made me like the clay, and wilt thou bring me into the duſt again? Haſt thou not poured me out as milk, and crudled me as cheeſe? Thou haſt clothed me with skin and fleſh, and haſt fenſed me with bones and ſinews.* Nature, that particular power which God hath put in every creature to do actions convenient to its *ſpecies*, is it ſelf Gods ſervant in the working as his creature in the being: and although it could by

the ſolitary virtue of its own form without a Divine concurrence work an effect, yet that effect alſo ſhould be Gods, it ſelf and the form of it being Gods: How much more ſhall God be the Authour of that which he worketh by it? As of the grain committed to the ground S. Paul ſaith, *God giveth it a body*; ſo it may be ſaid of this humane ſeed, God giveth it a body. The Father who knoweth the child better then the child the Father, and the Mother that knoweth the child better then the Father, (and therefore the Father loveth the child better then the child the Father, and the Mother loveth the child better then the Father, as he ſpeaketh in his Ethicks) know not yet how the child is wrought and made in the wombe. They know the effect, they know not the manner of the effecting. Eccles xi. 5. the ſecreſie of Gods way in making all things is expreſſed by the privateneſſe and obſcuritie how the bones do grow in the wombe of her that is with child. This is one of the wayes whereby he deſcribeth there ſymbolically the abſtruſeneſſe of Gods works: *As thou knoweſt not what is the way of the ſpirit, nor how the bones do grow in the wombe of her that is with child; even ſo thou knoweſt not the works of God who maketh all.* Certainly the matter of generation is not much unlike that matter out of which all things were created at firſt, which matter Moſes Gen. i. calleth *the heaven and the earth:* not formally ſo; but becauſe there was out of it to be produced, not by a phyſicall but omnipotent virtuality, the particulars of heaven and earth. And the ſame power that could, and goodneſſe that would, and wiſdome that knew how to faſhion out of ſuch a diſguiſed matter ſo brave a world, doth and muſt (if ever it be done) raiſe out of the ſemblable ſubject the

moſt

moſt exact and excellent ſtructure of the body of the modell of the univerſe. The Egyptian Doctour Triſmegiſt ſhall conclude the truth of this point, Νόησον, ὦ τέκνον, δημιουργούμενον ἐν τῇ μήτρᾳ τὸν ἄνθρωπον, καὶ τὴν δημιουργήσασαν καὶ τίνι τέχνῃ ἀκριβῶς ἐξύφανεν, *Underſtand, O Sonne, the framing of man in the wombe, ſearch out accurately the art of the building: learn who made this fair and divine ſhape of man*, as he goeth on. Τίς ὁ τὰς ὀφθαλμὰς περιγείλας; τίς ὁ τὰς ῥῖνας καὶ τὰ ὦτα τρυπήσας; *Who turned the eyes? who bored the noſtrils and eares? who extended and tied the ſinews? who derived the veins? who ſet and firmed the bones? who inveſted the fleſh with skin? who divided and branched the fingers? who hath inlarged our ſteps? who hath digged our pores? who hath ſtretched out the ſpleen? who hath made the heart like a pyramid? who hath drawn out the liver?* Τίς ὁ τὸν πνεύμονα συνεγείρας; *who hath made the lungs like a pipe? who made the capacious belly? who made the honourable parts of the body ſo viſible,* καὶ τὰ αἰσχρὰ κρύψας; *who made all theſe?* ποία μήτηρ; ποῖος πατήρ; *what mother? what father? who but the inviſible God who made all things with his will?* Thus we ſee that God is the Authour of us, and we are his *offſpring* in reſpect of our bodie.

Now from this diſcourſe of Gods being the Authour alſo, though mediately, of our bodies we may raiſe ſome inference to the good of our ſoul; but in a word or two: A little Philoſophie from heaven for our practice, and we paſſe to the ſecond point. Lord, didſt thou make our bodies; and yet do we uſe them as if we had made them our ſelves, or ſinne, or Satan: or as if they had been made by thee for them? How many organs haſt thou framed for the multiplicity of our operations, and yet how few, how little do we uſe thoſe few, if we uſe any for thy ſervice!

vice! Let us not dishonour this temple of the holy Ghost by uncleanneſſe, by fornication, by adultery, or any ſuch turpitude. *Other ſinnes*, as S. Paul 1. Cor. vi. 18. *are without the body*, ἐκτὸς τοῦ σώματός, *objectivé*; they paſſe no ſpeciall actuall pollution upon the body: *but he that committeth fornication ſinneth againſt his own body*. It was for this that Democritus pulled out his eyes, leſt he ſhould luſt upon ſight, as Tertullian in his Apologetick, not that he might the better addict himſelf to contemplate in Philoſophy. And Pythagoras his precept, ἀπὸ κυάμων ἀπέχεσθαι, was a precept againſt uncleanneſſe, κύαμοι ſignifying ſomewhat elſe beſides *beans*, wherein he himſelf delighted, as Gellius ſaith by the teſtimony of Ariſtoxenus, in his fourth book and 11 chapter.

Again, the body is an accurate ſtructure; admire the Artiſt, the Builder. And what wilt thou admire? what part? what member? wilt thou commend the breaſt? all thy Rhetorick is not enough for the belly. Wilt thou commend the belly? thou haſt not praiſes enough for the Head. What, the Eare? O glorious Eye! I ſhould admire the Arteries that come from the Heart; but the Nerves draw me back which come from the Brain; I ſhould praiſe the Nerves, but I am aſtoniſhed at the Veins which flow from the Liver. What ſhall I ſay of the Legs the pillars of the houſe? or rather of the Hands, the agents? What not of the Mouth, the doore, *into which mortall things enter, out of which immortall things proceed*, as Philo the Jew? But the Teeth, that ἄρκυν ὀδόντων, as he calleth them, barracadoe the Tongue, leſt it ſhould wander too much and be too talkative. O admirable creature in that we ſee of thee, the Body, though more admirable in that we ſee not, the Soul! Keep this piece,

this

this brave piece, handſome and clean: let it not be ſordid, untrim. It is the temple of the holy Ghoſt: beſtow on it a decent ornament, not gaudy. It is the ſervant to the ſoul; give it food ſufficient, and ſo tune the inſtrument the organ. Make not thy body as it were a trough by drunkenneſſe; that thy ſoul ſhould be as ſalt, as he ſaid, to keep thy body from rotting. Make not thy belly thy God, nor thy head thy Idole: They are Gods creatures: God doth not uſe to make Gods. Pride not thy ſelf in the ampleneſſe or majeſtie or proport of thy body; God could have made thy body a great deal bigger. God hath given thee the leſſe body that thou ſhouldeſt be the leſſe proud. So Theodoret in the expoſition of that place in Geneſis, *There were then giants upon the earth*, giveth the reaſon why God doth not make our bodies of that vaſtneſſe as he could, Εἰ γὰρ ἐν σμικρῷ σώματι ἀ κατ' ἀλλήλων ἀλλὰ κατ' αὐτῆ μεγαλαυχῶσι τῷ Θεῷ, τί ἂν οὐκ ἂν ἔδρασαν ἐι μείζονι σωμάτων μετέλαχον; *For if in thoſe ſmall bulks they ſwelled in pride, not onely againſt one another but alſo againſt God himſelf, what would they not have done if they had had more tall and mighty bodies?* But becauſe thy body is not ſo great, happily therefore more neat; and thou haſt *vires ingenuas*, as the Poet expreſſeth it: and ſo thou wilt glory in the feature of it: Nay, rather give glory to God in expreſſing the humilitie and ſubjection of thy ſpirit unto God by bodily worſhip. The ſervice of the body who will deny God, unleſſe thoſe who will deny God to be the authour of it? Nay, the Manichees, who denied God to be the authour of the body, did not: for they faſted on Sundayes, as it is ſtoried of them; and in faſting they exerciſed an humiliation of the body. This ſhall be left for Schwenckfeildians onely, who (as Zanchy of them) took away all

externall ſervice. As Chriſts Divinity was manifeſted in the fleſh; ſo ſhould our ſpiritualneſſe be manifeſted by the body. Man conſiſteth of body and ſoul; the ſervice of man therefore is the ſervice of both: Both are to be glorified; both are to glorifie: Both are from God; both are for God. Some give God the ſoul, not the body; theſe are few: ſuch Schwenckfeeldians: Some give God the body, not the ſoul; and many do ſo: ſuch are hypocrits: Some give God neither; Atheiſts: Some give God both; men Chriſtians. As Tertullian therefore of the old Chriſtians, ſo we; *Illuc ſuſpicientes manibus expanſis, quia innocuis, capite nudo, quia non erubeſcimus, oramus*; Looking up thither, unto heaven, with our hands ſtretched out, becauſe innocent, with our head bare, becauſe we are not aſhamed, we pray. And this ſervice of the body is indeed a ſmall and eaſie matter to perform, as lying in the power of freedome of will: and yet this is very requiſite. And we may erre in the ſervice of the outward man: yet hereby is not taken away the dueneſſe and right of a rectified outward worſhip. S. Paul diſcourſing of the Chriſtians complete armature, Epheſ. 6. biddeth us to *have our feet ſhod with the preparation of the Goſpel of peace.* We may tread this Goſpel awry: and we may tread it too much outward: and the ſect before mentioned treadeth it too much inward. Remember that good connſel, ὀρθοποδεῖν: or that of the Satyriſt Perſius,

——*pone in pectore dextram.*

Paſſe we now to our ſecond propoſition, We are the *offſpring* of God in reſpect of our Souls.

That God is the Authour of our bodies mediately by our parents, and that he was the Authour of the bodies of Adam and Eve immediately in regard of the Efficient,

we

we have determined: And is he the Authour of our materiated bodies, not of our immateriall ſouls? The efficiency of theſe we are come now by order to diſcourſe of; which deſerveth indeed rather a volume then ſome circumſcribed treatiſe and haſty diſquiſition. The knowledge and ſcience of it is very noble as Ariſtotle beginneth in his book of it; and none more difficult, as it may ſeem by Dicearchus, who doubted whether there were ſuch a thing *in rerum natura*, as Tully of him in his Tuſculane Queſtions. Yet if he would have examined his doubting, he might have found by it an evidence of its being; He could not have doubted of it without it. But the beginning and originall of it hath ever been matter of diſpute in a threefold reſpect. 1. of the Efficient, from whom it proceedeth: 2. of the Matter, out of which it ſhould be made; whether out of nothing *terminativè*, or out of ſome preexiſtent ſubject: 3. of the Time, when produced; whether from eternall or in time: and if in time, whether before the body be compoſed, or whether in the very inſtant of the finiſhing of it. Learned Zanchy, who ſtateth theſe heads of controverſie concerning the ſoul, *lib.* 2. *part.* 13. *cap.* 5. doth there reduce all the varieties of opinions concerning the ſoul unto theſe eight.

I. The firſt opinion is of thoſe who held that the ſoul is of God, but that it is made by God of the ſoul of the world, namely, the ſubſtance of the heavens; & that it is like the ſtarres, therefore incorruptible, immortall: & that there is a certain number of them, without increaſe or diminution; and that their manſion is in heaven, from whence they deſcend into particular bodies as they are framed. This was the tenet of Pythagoras and Plato, and

and of the Academicks, as Zanchy ſaith: and alſo this was not much different from the opinion of the Egyptian Doctour. This opinion was the ground of their μετεμψύχωσις or *Tranſanimation:* Which ſome of the Jews may be thought to have inclined unto, ſome of them ſaying that Chriſt was Elias, ſome that he was John Baptiſt, as if either of their ſouls had lived in Chriſts body: although others are of another mind, that they deemed that one of them were raiſed from the dead, as Barradius noteth. This was Herods phanſie of Chriſt, Matth. xiv. 2. *This is John the Baptiſt, he is riſen from the dead: and therefore mighty works do ſhew forth themſelves in him.* II. Others with Origen held that the ſouls were made in time, of nothing, by God; but all at once: and they held thoſe to be kept *in theſauro Dei*, to be ſent afterwards into their particular bodies. III. Some held not onely that they were made at once, but alſo of the ſubſtance of God; So the Stoicks; after them the Manichees. In this opinion the ſouls are *ex Deo* and *de Deo*; in the two former, *ex Deo*, not *de Deo*. IV. Another ſort would have the ſouls to be made by the Angels, *ex igne & ſpiritu:* neither *de Deo* nor *ex Deo:* So Seleucus, Hermeas, and the Carpocratians, who held that all the world was made by the Angels. Theſe foure opinions the Authour ſaith are antiquated with thoſe who profeſſe aſſent unto ſacred Scripture. V. The firſt of the other quaternion mainteined the firſt ſoul indeed to be created by God of nothing, and breathed into Adam, but the reſt to be propagated ſucceſſively with the propagation of the body, yet to be immortall. Theſe alſo were divided in their conceipts: Some thought the ſoul to be corporeall, and corporeally generated: Some thought it to be a Spirit, and ſpiritu-

ally

ally produced, somewhat like as one candle is lighted by another: Thus Apollinaris and others in the western Churches, as Zanchie saith. VI. Others denied the production of it *per traducem*, affirming that new souls are created simply by God, and each put into their proper bodies: This Jerome saith was the generall tenet and doctrine of the Church in his time. VII. Augustine neither condemned those who say that it cometh *per traducem*, nor those that say that souls are created *de novo* by God: yet he saith, he could not see how this opinion of the absolute creation of the soul could be confirmed by Scripture; therefore he desired Jerome to help him in this point with his advice. VIII. Lastly, some thought that the souls are dayly created by God: But some of these again imagined that the souls are created without the body, *extra corpus*, afterwards put in; others, that they are created in the infusion, and infused in the creation. But amidst and maugre all the rest, this is Zanchie's and may be our determination, That rationall souls are created immediately by God of nothing after the organizing of the body, or when the body is entirely organized, in the body. Not to meddle with the anasceuasticall or refutative part of the contrary assertions, (For *rectum est index sui & obliqui*) this thesis may seem more consonant to Scripture, to Ecclesiastick writers, to reason, to Heathen Authours: by all which we shall in order, but very briefly, try it. Onely we must premise here, That the time of the creation of the soul beareth an intimate respect unto the latter proposition, and that we need not make a distinct proving that it is created of nothing, since thus we have Zanchie for our præcedent: and 2. because those who contend for a matter out of

which the ſoul ſhould be made by God, are more exotick authours; and 3. their matter is altogether inconvenient; and 4. Creation in a proper ſenſe, which is an abſolute and ſimple creation, excludeth whatſoever matter; and 5. becauſe by this creation, abſtracting the conſideration *ex quo* from whence it is created, namely, out of nothing, we ſhall conclude againſt the way of production *per traducem*, which is the principall oppoſite opinion. So that now to the ſecond propoſition, as at firſt we named it, That God is the Authour of our ſouls, we ſhall adde in our diſcourſe a differencing of his efficiency of the body and the ſoul. Of our body he is the Authour by our Parents; of our ſoul abſolutely, by himſelf, by creation.

This we endeavour to prove firſt by Scripture. And the firſt place in Scripture ſhould be Exod. xxi. 22. wherein God giveth them a law concerning the ſtriking of a woman with child: But then we muſt reade the Scripture in the Septuagints tranſlation; and then two things are to be granted: firſt, that we have the right and true tranſlation of the Septuagint; and ſecondly, that this tranſlation is true, which indeed great Eccleſiaſtick writers have followed. The words in their verſion are theſe, Ἐὰν μάχωνται δύο ἄνδρες καὶ παταξωσι γυναῖκα ἐν γαστρὶ ἐχούσαν, καὶ ἐξέλθῃ τὸ παιδίον αὐτῆς μὴ ἐξεικονισμένον, ἀναζήμιον ζημιωθήσεται, *If two men ſtrive together and ſtrike a woman with child, and the child abortively cometh forth not ſhaped, he ſhall be mulcted: but,* ἐὰν ᾖ ἐξεικονισμένον, *if the child ſhall be fully ſhaped, then thou ſhalt pay life for life.* Whereupon is inferred by this Greek verſion, that during the time of the embryo there is no ſoul in it, and therefore if it periſh by the ſtroke, & the woman eſcape, the puniſhment muſt be but

but pecuniary; becauſe no murther, becauſe of no man, becauſe the ſoul is not in it: but if the child proveth abortive, and cometh out fully ſhaped, both muſt die; becauſe then the body is animated, and therefore it is murther. So that the ſoul is not propagated with the ſeed: for then the ſoul ſhould ſucceſſively grow to perfection with the body; and then there could be thus no abortive without murther. This reading the Greek Fathers, and others who generally do follow the Septuagint, do follow. Yet ſince the originall (which our Engliſh tranſlation followeth) maketh not at all for our purpoſe, we will paſſe over this place without any urging of it, and without any obſervation how the Interpreters, and in how many reſpects, were here miſtaken. Onely by the way we may take notice, that we have here the judgement of the Septuagint delivered in favour of our cauſe, and alſo the judgement of the Greek Fathers, and others who uſe their interpretation of Scripture, and alſo the determination of Canon law grounded (as one noteth) upon this place according to the Septuagint, That he is not a murtherer who maketh an abortive before the infuſion of the ſoul. The ſecond authority in Scripture may be Zach. xii. 1. *The burthen of the word of the Lord for Iſrael, ſaith the Lord, which ſtretcheth forth the heavens, and layeth the foundation of the earth and frameth the ſpirit of man within him,* בקרבו *in interiori ejus*, as Montanus rendreth it; *in medio*, as Pagnine. This place ſeemeth not onely to conclude the peculiar production of the ſoul by God, but the time alſo, eſpecially the manner, in the body, nay in the heart likely, which is (as they ſay) *primum vivens, ultimum moriens.* Iſa. lvii. 16. *For I will not contend for ever, neither will I be alwaies wroth: for the Spirit*

ſhould fail before me, and the ſouls which I have made. In this ſacred teſtimony I conceive two objections excluded: That it may be underſtood of the ſouls of our firſt Parents; this may be the firſt: But then it is to be anſwered, *Dicit pluraliter*, he ſpeaketh in generall, Soules; and he ſpeaketh as *de futuro*, I VVILL *not contend* FOR EVER, I VVILL *not be* ALVVAYES *wroth.* Secondly, It may be objected, That God may be ſaid to be the Authour of our ſouls, and to *make* our ſouls, although our parents do conduce, as God is ſaid to be the Authour of our bodies. It may be anſwereed, that God ſpeaketh here of the making of the ſouls, *ſignanter*, in way of eſpeciall appropriation, *which I have made*; I have made them. Eccles xii. 7. *Then ſhall the duſt return to the earth as it was, and the ſpirit ſhall return to God that gave it.* This Scripture was very potent with Auguſtine, as he confeſſeth in his tenth book *De Geneſi ad literam*, and the ninth chapter: But after ſome doubting he inclineth to the expoſition of it touching the ſoul of Adam, although the preacher ſeemeth to ſpeak it *in communi.* And if you ſay that God gave the Spirit by our parents; ſo he did the body: why then doth he ſpeak particularly, and onely of the Spirit, that he gave that? The laſt authority which we will uſe out of Scripture is, Heb. xii. 9. *Furthermore we have had Fathers of our fleſh which corrected us, and we gave them reverence: ſhall we not much rather be ſubject to the Father of Spirits, and live?* Here is an ἀντιδιαστολή, a contradiſtinction betwixt *Fathers of our fleſh* and *Father of our Spirits*: *Fathers of our fleſh*, ſubefficiently unto God; *Father of our Spirits*, abſolutely, immediately. And *Father of our Spirits* muſt be underſtood in reſpect of production, not regeneration, that the oppoſition may be

ſtrictly

ſtrictly *ad idem*. If, as before, ye ſay that he is Father of our Spirits by our Parents, ſo he is alſo of our fleſh, as before. *Memorabilis locus ad quæſtionem*, as Paræus breaketh out upon this place; This is a pertinent text for the deciding of the queſtion betwixt Auguſtine and Hierome concerning the beginning and efficiencie of the ſoul. Hierome could not produce a more pregnant teſtimonie for the determining of Auguſtine unto his tenet. Now to theſe divine teſtimonies we might adde an argument or two drawn out of ſacred writ. Zanchie argueth from the manner of the creation of Adams ſoul & of Chriſts, the like in all others.

But we will paſſe unto the ſecond head of our confirmation, That the creation of ſouls is more conſonant unto Eccleſiaſtick writers, Fathers. The conſent of theſe hath alwayes been accounted a moving argument. Οὐ γενναῖον ἀντιτείνειν τοῖς θεοῖς, πατρὶ καὶ δεσπότῃ, as he in his Rhetoricks; *It is not ingenuous to determine any thing contrary to the Gods, to a Father, to a Maſter.* Doctours Fathers then muſt have in them ſome perſwaſive virtue towards aſſent unto their judgements. Zanchie therefore citeth Hierome, Gregorie Nyſſen, Theodoret, Leo. And Hieromeſaith, as before, that it was the generall opinion of the Church in his time, that God is the Authour of ſouls by creation. Indeed we want herein the ſuffrages of Tertullian and Auguſtine. Tertullian ſaith plainly that the ſoul is corporeall: we have it in his book *De reſurrectione carnis*, IN TERMINIS TERMINANTIBUS; *Nos autem animam corporalem & hîc profitemur, & in ſuo volumine probamus*: And he giveth us his reaſon, becauſe of the ſouls ſuffering of torments; making account that the ſoul, unleſſe it be corporeal, cannot ſuffer. Auguſtine in his

tenth *De geneſi ad literam* goeth about at firſt to excuſe this expreſſion of the Father, in ſaying that the reaſon of this ſpeech was, becauſe he could not otherwiſe concieve it to be then in a corporeall notion: neither could he otherwiſe concieve of God, as Rhenanus in favour of him, *Timuit nè Deus nihil eſſet, ſi non eſſet corpus*, He was afraid leſt God ſhould not be, or ſhould be nothing, if not a body. Yet Auguſtine ſoon after his excuſe of the Father underſtandeth him otherwiſe in his term of CORPUS, even by his own words; becauſe he ſaith, *Omne corporale eſt paſſibile*, as if he meant by CORPORALE not onely a reall ſubſtance, but a ſubſtance materiall. *Debuit ergò mutare ſententiam*, ſaith the Father, becauſe hereby he maketh God paſſible. So that Auguſtine holdeth not with Tertullian, that the ſoul is corporeall, yet he doubteth whether it be created. And his reaſon is, Becauſe, if it be created by God, he cannot ſee how originall ſinne ſhould be conveyed unto it, which he knew ſo well, and defended ſo ſtoutly againſt Pelagius. To conclude therefore: If we could determine three concluſions in reference unto theſe two Fathers, we might obtein their voices alſo. Firſt, in reference unto Tertullian, That the ſoul, although not corporeall, yet is paſſible and ſenſible of grief. So Chriſt ſaith of his own ſoul, *my ſoul is heavy unto death*. And that Chriſts ſoul was immateriall who can deny, eſpecially ſince he was not born in the common way? Secondly, in reference unto S. Auguſtine, That although the ſoul be created, yet there is a way conceiveable for the intromiſſion of originall ſinne without any danger of making God any way the Authour of ſinne. This Zanchie maketh good. Thirdly, in reference unto them both, That a probable truth is not to be diſcarded

carded for ſome particular inconveniences, which in our apprehenſion may ſeem to ariſe out of the poſition of it. And *de facto*, that Saint Hierome wonne S. Auguſtine unto his ſide in this point, Paræus and Zanchie are my Authours; nay Lombard and Biel do cite Auguſtine in the three and twentieth chapter of the Queſtions *ex Veteri Teſtamento*, for the creation of the ſoul, *Inhoneſtum puto ſi animæ dicantur cum corporibus generari, ut anima naſcatur de anima.* And Biel to this purpoſe citeth Auguſtine, *De Eccleſiaſticis dogmatibus, Non ſeminantur animæ cum corporibus.* But to deal ingenuouſly with my audience; The former book of the Queſtions *ex veteri Teſtamento* is none of S. Auguſtines, as Bellarmine and Eraſmus and others do hold. And again, the Treatiſe *De Eccleſiaſticis dogmatibus*, is ſuppoſed to have been made by Gennadius. That the former is not the Fathers own is more then likely (beſide the judgement of thoſe before named) becauſe in it he citeth Auguſtine, whoſoever is the authour of it. Nevertheleſſe, deducting the ſuffrages of theſe two Fathers, the greater part (as Zanchie accounteth) are of opinion that the ſoul is created. Our Theſis then appeareth to be more conſonant unto the Fathers, to more of them; and to the reſt alſo happily it is more agreeable then the contrary aſſertion: and alſo thoſe two Fathers do ſhew more diſlike unto this tenet in reſpect of the conſequents, then in reſpect of the ſimple conſideration of it in it ſelf.

The third triall of the truth of our Theſis is by the conſonance unto reaſon. And the firſt Argument may be thus; Either the ſoul is created by God or propagated by our parents: Not propagated by our parents: For if ſo, then by ſome ſeed, or by nothing. If of nothing, then

then it is not of our parents, but it is created: If it be of ſome ſeed, then either ψυχικὸν or σαρκικὸν, either corporall or ſpirituall. If corporall; the ſoul is materiall; ſo corruptible, ſo mortall: If the ſeed be ſpirituall, then either that ſeed is corruptible and mortall, or incorruptible and immortall. If corruptible and mortall; ſo is the ſoul, the effect bearing proportion and ſimilitude unto the cauſe: If incorruptible and immortall; then either the ſoul is not generated, and therefore why ſeed? (and indeed how ſeed of the ſoul, whether corruptible or incorruptible? and therefore how generative?) Or if the ſoul be generated, then what is in its nature incorruptible muſt be corruptible by generation; for generation importeth corruption. This is in effect Zanchie's argument in the forecited place. Secondly, as we argue *à priori*, from the Immateriality of the ſoul unto the Immortality of it; ſo reciprocally we may argue *à poſteriori*, from the Immortalitie of the ſoul to the Immaterialitie of it. And we need not fear a circular demonſtration *in diverſo genere demonſtrationis*. Now if we prove it immatertall, then it is not *ex traduce*, not by our parents; and if it be immortall, then it is not materiated. Now the immortality of the ſoul thoſe Eccleſiaſticall writers could not deny, who yet would not grant that it is created, but thought it might be produced *cum ſemine*. Aquinas, *part. 1. quæſt. 118. art. 2.* concludeth that it is hereticall to hold the traduction of the ſoul: Sure much more is it hereticall to hold the Mortality of it. And indeed he giveth his reaſon why it is hereticall to maintein the traduction of it, in regard of the conſequent, becauſe ſo it would be mortall: if mortall, where is our reſurrection? if no reſurrection, where is our Chriſtianity? The immortality then

then of the soul we may take as confessed and granted; which was assevered even by the learned Heathen, Trismegist, Plato, Thales, Plutarch, Pindar, Virgil, as we might see by their severall testimonies; if it were necessary to recite them, they being so well known. As for Aristotle in this point, it is commonly said of him,

——— οὐκ ἂν γνώνῃς πατέροισι μετείη,

as if he were a Vertumnus, determined neither *pro* nor *con*: Yet were he well inquired into, we should find him to be on our side. But thirdly, Bonaventure's Argument, as Biel citeth it, is worth the naming, though it be not fit for urging, as being drawn from convenience onely: Since the soul is the image of God, *& nata immediatè fieri in Deum*, made to be happified in him by a clear vision of him, and by a fruition in loving him with all our soul, by which love our soul is spiritually united unto him, it becometh, it is fitting that the whole being of it should be immediately from God, with whom it is to be wholly united. And so much, or rather so little, in respect of what might be said for the third way of the triall of our Thesis.

The fourth and last is, the inartificiall argument of Ethnick authority. This assertion of the creation of the soul by God is not destitute of humane suffrages. Besides all their opinions who hold that the souls were created from eternall, we have other testimonies. I will give you one or two, which may be a signe of more. Learned Zanchy quoteth Pythagoras, Epictetus, Trismegist, Simplicius, Zoroaster, Aristotle. First, Pythagoras;

Ἀλλὰ σὺ θάρσει, ἐπεὶ θεῖον γένος ἐστὶ βροτοῖσι,

Be of a valiant spirit, since Mans descent is Divine: which he supposeth Pythagoras understood in regard of the

ſoul, as ſurely he did. As for his μετεμψύχωσις or *Tranſanimation*, if it concerned very much our purpoſe, it were not very difficult to vindicate him from it, and many other abſurdities, which either ignorant or envious men attributed to him as Reuchline obſerveth in his ſecond book. Epictetus; Καὶ συγγενεῖς ἐσμεν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐξ ἀρχῆς καὶ ἀπ' ἐκείνου ἐληλύθαμεν. ἄφες ἡμᾶς ἐπιδεῖν ὅθεν ἐξελθόντες ἥκομεν, *We are akin to God, from him we came: Suffer us to go from whence we came.* Simplicius; Καὶ γὰρ ἡ ψυχὴ ἀπὸ Θεοῦ ἐλλάμπεσθαι λέγεται, *The ſoul is ſaid to proceed from God as a beam from the ſunne.* Zoroaſter very clearly; Χρὴ σπουδὴν ποιεῖσθαι πρὸς τὸ φάος τοῦ πατρὸς ἐξ οὗ σοι ψυχὴ πολλὰ ἐννοοῦσα ἐνδέδυται νοῦν. *Thou muſt make ſpeed unto the light and the glories of thy father: from thence was thy ſoul ſent down endued with much underſtanding.* Triſmegiſt; Ὁ νοῦς οὐκ ἔστιν ἀποτελεσμένος τοῦ θεοποιοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀλλ' ὥσπερ ἡ πλευρὰ καὶ ἡ καρδία τοῦ ἡλίου φῶς. But the queſtion now is, how we ſhall conſtrue νοῦς, what it ſignifieth with Triſmegiſt. *Salvo meliori judicio*, I cannot ſee what ſenſe or notion may be framed of his νοῦς to our purpoſe. He ſeemeth not to underſtand hereby the Mind or Soul: For he often diſtinguiſheth νοῦς and ψυχή: and immediately after the place which Zanchie quoteth he ſpeaketh thus, Οὗτος ὁ νοῦς ἐν μὲν ἀνθρώποις θεός ἐστι· διὸ καὶ τινες τοὺς ἀνθρώπους θεοὺς εἶπον, *This* νοῦς *in men is a Divinity: and therefore ſome men are Gods.* Me thinketh he intendeth hereby ſome intelligent power ſeparated from the ſoul. To paſſe him therefore; Ariſtotle may be next: who bringeth in as clear an authority for our behalf as any: Nay none ſo clear as that in his ſecond book *De generat. animal.* c. 3. Λείπεται δὴ τὸν νοῦν μόνον θύραθεν ἐπεισιέναι, καὶ θεῖον εἶναι μόνον. And the reaſon followeth; οὐδὲν γὰρ αὐτοῦ τῇ ἐνεργείᾳ κοινωνεῖ σωματικὴ ἐνέργεια, *It remaineth that the mind cometh from without*

without, and is onely divine, becauſe no corporeall operation is mixed with its: by which place and another in his *De Anima* we may inferre Ariſtotle's opinion concerning the immortalitie of the ſoul. He ſaith in his firſt book *De Anima*, Εἰ τὶς ἐστὶν ἰδία ἐνέργεια, *If there be any operation proper and peculiar to the ſoul, it may be ſeparated: if ſeparated, then immortall.* Here he aſſumeth; *The bodily operation is not mixed with the operation of the mind: therefore ſeparable; therefore immortall.* Pariſienſis in his treatiſe *De Legibus* ſaith, *Omnes enim animæ creantur in corporibus ſuis, ſicut declarat Ariſtoteles.* He nameth not where Ariſtotle declareth himſelf thus; but ſurely there cannot be a clearer paſſage for that opinion, then the forenamed in his ſecond *De generat. anim.* If it be objected that Ariſtotle taketh νοῦς as Triſmegiſt doth, it may be anſwered, 1. we may underſtand his meaning by the title of the book, according to the rule, *Titulus libri ſæpe eſt legendus.* 2. he diſcuſſeth in that chapter the production and the time of the production of ſouls. Tully is plain in the firſt of his Tuſculane queſtions, *Animorum nulla in terris origo inveniri poteſt.* Pindar alſo, as I find him quoted, ſpeaking of the ſoul, which he calleth ζῶον, ſaith, τὸ γὰρ ἐστι μόνον ἐκ θεῶν, *This onely cometh from heaven.* Seneca in his cxx. epiſtle, *Maximum inquam, mi Lucili, argumentum animi ab altiori venientis ſede; A very great argument of the ſouls coming down from heaven it is, if it accounteth theſe things wherein it is here below converſant, baſe and low and too ſtrait for it; if it feare not to go out: for knowing from whence it came, it knoweth whether it is going.* To theſe teſtimonies more might be added, as Morney collecteth them in his fifteenth chapter, where he treateth *de immortalitate animæ.* Zan-

chic believeth that this was Aratus his meaning, not onely, That God was the first and universall cause of the soul, as he is of the body and all things else, but, That the substance of the soul is not made of the Elements or of any heavenly substance, but that it is a creature absolutely divine. Thus we have seen our Thesis agreeable to sacred Scripture, to Fathers, to reason, to Ethnick authority. We have touched a tickliſh cause and a grave controversie. A young man, one Vincentius Victor (as Chemnitius relateth) when learned Augustine demurred and would not determine this point concerning the originall of a rationall soul, censured boldly the Fathers unresolvednesse, and vaunted that he would undertake to prove by demonstration that souls are created *de novo*, by God: For which peremptory rashnesse the Father returned the young man a sober reprehension. But I therefore, lest I should be obnoxious to the like reproof, have not so much determined the point evident, as argued it probable. However it is *res quæstionis*, not *res fidei*. It standeth not upon our salvation to believe the one or the other; either that it is, or it is not created. As he then concludeth his Rhetoricks, so I this little discussion of this great controversie, ἴσχει, κεῖται.

The third respect wherein we are Gods offspring is the Union of body and soul together, which maketh our third proposition, as we formerly propounded it, We are Gods *offspring* in respect of body and soul together. I will not here runne into the nice dispute, whether *A B* be *Ab*; Whether the whole man really differeth from the parts taken together: and so whether God in the uniting of them be a cause of a new Entitie. God almighty, who made bodies and souls (though in a diffe-

rent

rent manner betwixt the first bodies, namely of our first Parents, and the rest, and in a different manner betwixt bodies and souls) made one for the other, the body to receive the soul, the soul to enlive and inform the body. And here we are to consider the time of the creation of the soul, according as we apprehend it in probability to be created: And here we have the way how we are the offspring of God in respect of body and soul together, in that the form is framed in the matter prepared. As God made man when all things in the world were ready and dressed to shew him enterteinment, so likely he maketh the soul when the body, the house, is furnished with rooms for the abode and working of it. And that he maketh not the soul *extra materiam*, without the body, but in it, Biels argument may evince, beside whatsoever may be said out of the places in Scripture before named against the contrary. His argument is this, *Quia tunc anima haberet aliquem actum volendi vel intelligendi priusquam infunderetur*: If the soul were created out from the body, then it would exercise some act of understanding and willing before it were infused: For such a divine creature cannot be idle and unactive. If it should exercise any act before the union, it should merit before the union, as he saith: We deny his merit, but we cannot well imagine how the soul should exercise any act of understanding and will before it be in the body. And this S. Paul supposeth, as Biel noteth, Rom. ix. 11, *For the children not being yet born, neither having done good or evil: Neither good nor evil* is done before birth. Moreover, how that good act, if any, though not meritorious, yet should be rewarded to the soul peculiarly, besides the reward for those actions of it in the body, we cannot well con-

ceive. For *every man ſhall recieve according to what he hath done in the body*. The Perſon ſhall recieve according to the actions of the perſon; the Soul is not a Perſon. A queſtion here may ariſe, Why God ſhould unite this ſoul to this body: Why ſhould this glorious ſoul dwell in this corruptible body: this royall tenant in ſo low a cottage: this vaſt ſpirit in a circumſcribed skin: as if not onely Galba's wit but all our ſouls did *male habitare*. For anſwer, 1. The higheſt cauſe is the beſt, Gods pleaſure, Gods λόγος (his *reaſon*, as we may ſay) and his θέλημα, his *will*, the Egyptian Doctour taketh for the ſame. 2. Likely for the order of the Univerſe; that as there is a created rationall ſpirit without a body, namely the Angel, ſo there ſhould be a created rationall Spirit (though not rationall in that degree of perfection) in a body. 3. The Poet;

——*Et quod dominari in cætera poſſit*
Natus homo eſt.——

Lombard upon this queſtion, in his firſt Diſtinction of the ſecond book, giveth another, That by the conjunction of the ſoul with the body, ſo farre its inferiour, man might learn and believe a poſſibility of the union of man with God in glory, notwithſtanding the vaſt diſtance of nature and excellence, the infiniteneſſe of both in God, the finiteneſſe of both in man. But our ſoul in the moment of union with the body is defiled with originall ſinne: But our nature ſinned in Adam; and the order of the Univerſe and the glory of Chriſts redemption are of greater moment, as Zanchie.

Now out of the conjunction of ſoul with body we might have the reſultance of deductions and inferences many and important ones. We might have raiſed an exhortation

hortation peculiar unto the ſoul, That it is the braveſt ſubſtance under heaven, and therefore that we ſhould fit it with the pureſt accident: We ſhould adorn it with the beſt habit, of Faith, of Love, of Hope; That when we think, we ſhould think of our ſelves, when we think upon our ſelves, we ſhould think upon our ſoul; when we think upon our ſoul, we ſhould think that it is from God abſolutely, and that it is immortall, and that we ſhould provide for it accordingly. Get this ſoul beautified with white and red, Chriſts Bloud, his Righteouſneſſe.

And when thou thinkeſt of thy ſelf compoſed of body and ſoul (for who in the body, even while he thinketh of the ſoul, will forget his body) 1. conſider what is due from hence to him that made thee a man, not a beaſt, what piety, what devotion, what obedience, what rationall ſervice, what *rationall* or *reaſonable ſacrifice*, as Triſmegiſt ſpeaketh. 2. from hence alſo conſider what an ingagement there is of love and friendſhip and juſtice unto our neighbour, ſince he who made him made us: We are all of the ſame make, all of the ſame nature. Job is moved hereby to do no wrong, no not to his very ſervant, Job xxxi. 15. *Did not he that made me in the wombe, make him? and did not one faſhion us in the wombe?* 3. from Gods conjunction of both together we are bound to maintein the union. As in the conjunction of man and wife, ſo in the conjunction of body and ſoul, *What God hath joyned together, let no man put aſunder*: no private man, no Magiſtrate unjuſtly; not our ſelves, for no cauſe. Let both grow together (as we may ſpeak) untill the harveſt, untill thou beeſt fairly cut down by that common ſickle of Death, and laid in the granary of the grave. 4. We learn hence humility. Our beſt excellence is in our ſoul:

Our

Our ſoul is in an earthly tabernacle, eaſily reſolved into its principles, undone with a flie, deſtroyed with a grape-ſtone, cracked with a ſhell. All our learning is ſoon refuted with one black ☞, which underſtanding us not, ſnappeth us unreſpectively without any diſtinction, and putteth at once a period to our reading and to our being. Look we upon our black feet; nay below our feet unto the duſt: reade we, and meditate, and learn meekneſſe and humilitie in this originall. 5. It is our duty, ſince God is thus our Father in regard of body and ſoul, to rely upon his care and providence for a living in the world, and infinitely more then upon the care of the fathers of our fleſh. God is more principally our Father: They of the body, ſubordinately unto God; God of the ſoul, excluding them: They men, not God; therefore not able to ſee what is beſt for us: They men, not God; therefore not able to foreſee all dangers: They men, not God; therefore not able alwayes to help us: They men, not God; therefore changeable in their affection: They men, not God; therefore changeable in their being. What power the Father of our fleſh hath, he hath from God; what goodneſſe, from God: God ſuſteineth his nature, concurreth with his action, bleſſeth the effect. 6. Laſtly, we have hence S. Pauls concluſion (in the next verſe) which ſhall be mine, *For as much then as we are the offspring of God, we are not to think that the Godhead is like unto ſilver or gold or ſtone, graven by art and mans deviſe:* Whereby is intimated, that the Heathens did make memorials of God by creatures, which they repreſented in images of ſilver, of gold, of ſtone. This concluſion we have touched before: to proſecute it were to begin another text.

FINIS.